

## SENATE

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the fresh mercies of yet another day we come with hearts grateful for Thy grace, praying that by a strength not our own our individual record may be kept unstained by any word or act unworthy of the creed we profess.

Thou knowest that these testing times are finding out our every weakness and calling for our utmost endeavor against the wrong that needs resistance and for the right that needs assistance.

Make us ever aware that in the most fateful struggle in human history—

"We are watchers of a beacon whose light must never die;

"We are guardians of an altar that shows Thee ever nigh;

"We are children of Thy freemen who sleep beneath the sod;

"For the might of Thine arm we bless Thee, our God, our father's God."

Amen.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, a Senator from the State of California, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. KUCHEL thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 16, 1965, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2042) to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill

(H.R. 4750) to provide a 2-year extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5768) to extend for an additional temporary period the existing suspension of duties on certain classifications of yarn of silk.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7969) to correct certain errors in the Tariff Schedules of the United States.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during sessions of the Senate Tuesday and Wednesday of next week.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Arthur M. Ross, of California, to be Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I also report favorably sundry nominations in the Public Health Service. Since these names have previously appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Henry Bosshard, and sundry other candidates, for personnel action in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following calendar measures were considered and acted upon as indicated, and excerpts from the committee reports thereon were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## THE MANAGEMENT OF THE NATIONAL DEBT AND TAX STRUCTURE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1013) to clarify the components of and to assist in the management of the national debt and the tax structure which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "liabilities," to insert "and the unfunded liabilities"; and, on page 2, line 8, after the word "probable", to strike out "risk" and insert "risk, and shall also set forth all other assets available to liquidate liabilities of the Government"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall, on or before March 31 of each year (beginning with 1966), submit to the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth, as of the close of December 31 of the preceding year, the aggregate and individual amounts of the contingent liabilities and the unfunded liabilities of the Government, and of each department, agency, and instrumentality thereof, including, without limitation, trust fund liabilities, Government-sponsored corporations' liabilities, indirect liabilities not included as a part of the public debt, and liabilities of insurance and annuity programs, including their actuarial status on both a balance sheet and projected source and application of funds basis. The report shall also set forth the collateral pledged, or the assets available (or to be realized), as security for such liabilities (Government securities to be separately noted), and an analysis of their significance in terms of past experience and probable risk, and shall also set forth all other assets available to liquidate liabilities of the*

Government. The report shall set forth the required data in a concise form, with such explanatory material as the Secretary may determine to be necessary or desirable, and shall include total amounts of each category according to the department, agency, or instrumentality involved.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the absence of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I think I should say, with respect to this bill, that what he proposes is to set up a complete balance sheet for every activity of government. That has never been done before, and I think it will prove to be one of the most useful documents that the Senate will ever have authorized. I may wish to amplify my remarks on it at some later time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, while I was absent for a few minutes when Senator DIRKSEN spoke on this bill I would like to speak briefly on the need for better reporting of the Federal debt. I am very pleased that the Senate today passed my bill, S. 1013.

We now have a statutory national debt of \$318 billion, and also acknowledge in addition contingent debt and Federal guarantees of about \$400 billion. Actual payments under guarantees will, of course, be much smaller than that, and many of the accounts are covered by adequate reserves. But, this bill is concerned with a growing area of Federal debt which is reported sporadically or not at all. The amount here may approach a trillion dollars. At present we do not know.

In 1957, I introduced legislation to require the regular reduction of the statutory Federal debt in years when no national emergency existed. Friends have pointed out to me that we have been in a state of continual national emergency and, furthermore, while our statutory debt has been increasing, our unreported Federal liabilities have been increasing even faster and are not even fully known. Realizing the importance of this area, in the next Congress, I included in my debt reduction bill, a requirement for reports on this unreported debt. In the 87th Congress, when the international situation continued to be difficult, I decided that it would be best to concentrate on the better reporting of the Federal debt, for all our debt has had to increase regularly in order to meet the growing liabilities of the Federal Government.

We have many kinds of Federal obligations—salaries, real estate leases—at my suggestion a full report on these and real estate owned is now made each year to the Senate Appropriations Committee, copies are available to those people interested—procurement of goods and services, and others including some of our international obligations. Reports are made on many of these items, while others are less well recognized.

A very important area, however, which, as I say, is reported sporadically or not at all, is that of future payments for past services rendered, such as retirement funds, social security funds, and other types of payments with insur-

ance characteristics. Both on an annual operating basis, and on a capital or balance sheet basis, the total amount of these Federal Government liabilities is very large.

Some of these obligations are carried under separate trust funds, such as social security or civil service retirement. Others are provided for under annual appropriations. But, in all cases, the payee looks to the Federal Treasury for his security, and this we must guarantee.

I believe strongly that under these circumstances we should know the size of these obligations and, more important, the public is entitled to know what the status of these funds is. If a special fund is assigned to make the payment, will the money be in the fund? If the money is to be appropriated on an annual basis, what will be the effect on the Federal budget? These are two vital questions which many householders try to ascertain for themselves in their own affairs. We in the Federal Government should attempt to do likewise.

Recently, I asked the Treasury Department, which in past years during discussion of my earlier bills has offered to make statements available to Members of Congress, what figures they could give me. I attach the table they sent me in response. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Annuity and pension systems of the Federal Government*

Title	Most recent actuarial valuation	Valuation interest rate	Actuarial deficit	Supported by cash projection (yes or no)
		Percent	Millions	
Federal civilian employees retirement systems:				
Civil Service	June 30, 1963	3.5	\$34,060	No.
Foreign Service	Dec. 31, 1962	4.0	203	Yes.
Retirement system of the Tennessee Valley Authority	June 30, 1964	3.5	39	No.
Federal judiciary	(1)			
Judiciary of territories	(1)			
Judiciary of District of Columbia	(1)			
Judicial survivors annuity fund	Dec. 31, 1961	3.0	13	Yes.
Judiciary of Tax Court	(1)			
Tax Court judges survivors annuity fund	(1)			
Social security:				
Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system	Jan. 1, 1962	3.0	321,000	Yes.
Railroad retirement system	Dec. 31, 1962	3.0	4,244	No.
Uniformed services retirement systems:				
Retired pay, Defense	July 1, 1963 <sup>2</sup>	3.0	55,200	No.
Retired pay, U.S. Coast Guard (includes lighthouse and lifesaving services)	June 30, 1963 <sup>2</sup>	3.0	744	No.
Retired pay of commissioned officers, Coast and Geodetic Survey	(1)			
Veterans benefit programs:				
Veterans compensation program (service-connected disability or death)	(1)			
Veterans pension program (Non-service-connected disability or death or for service)	(1)			
Servicemen's indemnity program	(1)			
Miscellaneous:				
District of Columbia teachers' retirement system	June 30, 1961	3.0	101	Yes.
Policemen and firemen's retirement and disability, District of Columbia	Dec. 31, 1962	3.0	92	No.
Annuities under special acts:				
Panama Canal construction workers	June 30, 1953	3.0	17	No.
Widows of former employees of the Lighthouse Service	(1)			
Federal Employees' Compensation Act	(1)			
Board of Governors plan of the Federal Reserve banks retirement system	Feb. 28, 1963	3.0	None	No.

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

<sup>2</sup> Not a formal actuarial study; based on estimates.

NOTE.—This table was compiled from the latest available actuaries' statements or other official sources. By nature, the concept of an actuarial deficit (often called unfunded liability) rests on broad assumptions which are subject to wide variation. Besides the interest rate assumption, 2 of the most common are the assumption that general salary scales will remain constant, and the assumption that there will be no change in existing benefit provisions. It cannot be said that the bases for the various components of the tables are entirely uniform.

There are 2 different concepts of actuarial deficit as used by the actuaries in their development of the data. All systems listed except the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and the railroad retirement use a concept based primarily on the accrual of benefits for past services, disregarding the provision, or lack of provision, for financing future contributions to the fund. In the computation of the deficit for OASDI and RR the concept which is used is based on past service benefit accruals, plus future service benefit accruals to the extent not covered by existing financing provisions. Both concepts are defined in terms of the existing covered group, assuming no new entrants to the respective systems. The validity of this latter assumption as a basis for expressing actuarial status, particularly for the national compulsory social insurance

system, has been seriously questioned as being "artificial and unrealistic," and as a result the unfunded liability for OASDI "is not significant from a long-range financing standpoint." (See Robert Myers' "Actuarially, We're in Balance," OASIS: June 1963.) In their 23d annual report dated Feb. 28, 1963, for OASDI and DI trust funds, the Board of Trustees stated "that the system as a whole remains in close actuarial balance."

A general definition of an actuarial deficit may be stated as the present value of future benefits, less the present value of future normal contributions, less the existing fund. For example, the civil service retirement concept differs from the OASDI concept only insofar as they use different assumptions for the flow of future contributions for the closed group. The civil service retirement system computation is based on "normal contributions" which roughly approximate the amounts that would have to be paid into the fund each year to cover the benefits accruing from that year's service (whether or not the contributions are likely to be made is not a consideration in the computation of the actuarial deficit as of any given date); but if the normal contributions are not made, the deficit continues to increase—other things being equal. The OASDI computation, on the other hand, is based on scheduled contributions under existing law, or, in other words, estimated future contributions by the existing group or covered employees and employers at the rates presently prescribed by law.



Mr. SALTONSTALL. You will note that the actuarial evaluations in cases such as social security and civil service have not been figured for a number of years, and in other cases less important have not been figured at all. The fact that we have had several increases in retirement benefits since those evaluations were made only increases the problem.

Besides those mentioned in the above table, there are a number of other insurance-type programs such as FHA programs, ship mortgage programs and FDIC. Payment forecasts for these are much more difficult than for the pension, for the actuarial calculations have more guesswork in them. But, better reports to the best of the Federal Government's ability, should also be made on these. Category totals are now listed under the contingency statement, but not the predicted payments.

I am awfully pleased that the Finance Committee has seen fit to report my bill favorably and the Senate has passed it unanimously. Last year following Senate passage, the House was unable to take it up in the Ways and Means Committee due to the long hours spent on the tax cut. I hope that this year they will have an opportunity to act on it, and to send it to the President during this Congress. There is a need for better management of our budget in this area, and it is my hope that this bill will contribute to improved responsibility in our Federal Government's affairs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT SUMMARY OF THE BILL

This bill would require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit annually to the Congress a brief report setting forth the amounts of the contingent and unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government, including those of agencies and instrumentalities of the Government.

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

In the past it has been the practice of the Federal Government to determine its financial requirements on an annual basis. This bill does not depart from this practice. However, an annual system of budgeting does not present a complete picture of the financial condition of the United States because it fails to depict numerous categories of Federal obligations and commitments which are subject to contingencies. Similarly, it fails to reveal fully those situations where Congress has enacted spending authorizations, but has not specifically appropriated the moneys needed to fulfill the statutory commitment.

Moreover, by present methods, U.S. liability under many of its insurance and guarantee programs is difficult to measure and analyze. This is because sufficient information regarding these programs either is not available at all, or if it is available, it is inadequately presented.

In many cases information with respect to contingent liabilities of specific governmental programs now is available only in reports of specific agencies or corporations. However, these data frequently lose much of their usefulness because they are not com-

bined with similar data with respect to other programs. Thus, although part of this information may now be available it is not published in one place or on a uniform basis, and does not facilitate understanding of the current financial condition of the United States.

Your committee believes that it is desirable to make available in a single, concise report, pertinent information with respect to the current status of the contingent liabilities of the Federal Government, including its long-range obligations and commitments. Indeed, the committee recognizes a responsibility to make available in such a report—as clear and complete as possible—the overall financial condition of our Government. Such a report, consolidating information now available only in part in many diverse reports with information which is not now available at all, will enable the Congress to have a better understanding of the current fiscal needs of the Federal Government.

For this reason, the committee has approved, and recommends enactment of a bill requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to submit to the Congress, by March 31 of each year, a report showing the amount (both on an aggregate and on an individual basis) of the contingent liabilities and the unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government determined as of December 31 of each year, commencing with 1966.

The contingent liabilities referred to by the bill include (1) liability of the Government under its various trust funds, such as the old age and survivors insurance trust fund and the highway trust fund; (2) liabilities of Government-sponsored corporations (for example, the Commodity Credit Corporation); (3) indirect liabilities of the Federal Government not included as part of the public debt, such as Federal Housing Administration debentures; and (4) liabilities of Federal insurance and annuity programs.

Under the bill, data with respect to these insurance and annuity programs (which include the civil service retirement system, veterans' pension, and war risk insurance programs) is to include information regarding their actuarial status on both a balance-sheet basis and a projected source-and-application-of-funds basis.

Where appropriate, the report is also to indicate the collateral pledged, or the assets available, as security for the specified liabilities, and an analysis of their significance in terms of past experience and probable risks. Thus, for example, in the case of federally insured home mortgages the assets available on foreclosure may, in favorable circumstances, offset the potential Federal liability. But the reporting of assets is not to stop with a recording of assets related to the liabilities. Under a committee amendment the Secretary of the Treasury is to set forth all other assets which would be available to liquidate liabilities of the Federal Government.

In order to provide flexibility and to present data included in the report from being misconstrued or misleading, the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may set forth such explanatory material as he determines to be necessary or desirable. Under this provision, if he believes particular data are likely to lead to improper conclusions, he may qualify that data sufficiently to negate such conclusions.

Although the Bureau of the Budget does not favor the bill, in its report to the committee on a virtually identical bill in the 88th Congress (dated Dec. 12, 1963), it indicated its agreement with the objectives of the bill as follows:

"We agree with the objectives of S. 2281 that the Congress and its committees should have available whatever information they need with respect to the financial status of the Government. In accordance with this

objective, the Treasury Department has been preparing, semiannually, for a number of years, a statement on long-range commitments and contingencies of the U.S. Government. The Bureau of the Budget has on occasion worked informally with Treasury staff on this matter, and consideration has been given to possible extensions and refinements of the data. I believe that more can be done in this respect and, together with the Treasury Department, we shall work with the responsible Government agencies to this end.

"If, in addition, your committee or any other committee of the Congress would like to have particular tabulations, such as those described in S. 2281, we believe it would be appropriate to ask the Treasury Department to supply them when needed. However, we believe the nature of such tabulations should be left flexible, to be determined from time to time, rather than being fixed in a statute."

It is the opinion of the Committee on Finance, as already indicated, that the bill, as reported, preserves the flexibility of tabulations urged in the departmental report.

Moreover, the committee fully recognizes the desirability of refining data now being compiled in order to make it more meaningful and useful, and the bill as reported permits this. By drawing together tabulations regarding contingent liabilities of various departments, agencies, and Government-sponsored corporations, no doubt the Treasury Department will find new ways by which statistical refinements can be made, and tabulating methods improved. This can only serve to increase the quality of the report required by the bill.

The report will fill a need which has been felt by the Congress for many years.

#### TWO ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1804) to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the U.S. Court of Claims, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional associate judges for the Court of Claims.

(b) In order to reflect the changes in the number of permanent associate judges of the Court of Claims caused by this section, section 171 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the word "four" in the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the word "six".

Sec. 2. Section 175 of title 28, United States Code, in its present form is stricken, and the following section is inserted as section 175 of title 28 of the United States Code:

"§ 175. Assignment of judges; divisions; hearings; quorum; decisions

"(a) Judges of the Court of Claims shall sit on the court and its divisions in such order and at such times as the court directs.

"(b) The Court of Claims may authorize the hearing and determination of cases and controversies by separate divisions, each consisting of three judges. Such divisions shall sit at the times and places and hear the cases and controversies assigned as the court directs.

"(c) Cases and controversies shall be heard and determined by a court or division of not more than three judges, unless a hearing en banc is ordered by the court or by the chief judge. The court en banc for an initial hearing shall consist of the judges of the Court of Claims in regular active

service. In case of a vacancy in the court or of the inability of a judge thereof in regular active service to sit, a justice or judge assigned to the court pursuant to chapter 13 of this title shall be competent to sit in the court en banc when designated by the court to do so.

"(d) A rehearing en banc may be ordered by a majority of the judges of the Court of Claims in regular active service. The court en banc for a rehearing shall consist of the judges of the Court of Claims in regular active service. A judge of the Court of Claims who has retired from regular active service shall also be competent to sit as a judge of the court en banc in the rehearing of a case or controversy if he sat on the court or division at the original hearing thereof.

"(e) Two judges shall constitute a quorum of a division of the Court of Claims, four judges shall constitute a quorum of a court en banc.

"(f) A majority of the judges or justices who actually sit on the court or division or court en banc must concur in any decision."

Sec. 3. Item 175 in the analysis of chapter 7 of title 28 of the United States Code, immediately preceding section 171, is amended to read as follows: "175. Assignment of judges; divisions; hearings; quorum; decisions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

##### STATEMENT

The proposed legislation was approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States at its recent session in March 1965. The court at present has a complement of five judges. This is the same number that it had in 1863. In the ensuing 100 years only one major request has been made to the Congress in assisting the court's business. That was in 1925 when the Congress authorized the court to appoint a staff of five commissioners to assist in trying the mass of cases that followed World War I. Subsequently this was increased to 15 trial commissioners.

In the letter of transmittal of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the need for the additional judges is based on the increase over the past several years in the backlog of cases in the judges' docket that despite the work of the trial commissioners, the number of opinions which they have filed and which have been adopted by the court has not been sufficient to obviate the need for additional judges. The creation of the backlog of cases is not due primarily to an increase in the total number of suits filed in the court, but mainly because of the substantial increase in the number of lengthy, complex cases. Many of the cases to be decided fall in the category of protracted litigation. Chiefly, these include suits for breach of contracts entered into with the Government, suits for infringement of patents by the Government, appeals from the Indian Claims Commission, and a substantial number of actions brought for the refund of taxes. In addition the requirement of 28 U.S.C. 175 that concurrence of three judges is necessary to any decision, in effect provides that the cases must be heard en banc by the whole court, has slowed the decisionmaking process. This legislation would also allow the Court of Claims to sit in divisions, as well as en banc. The court has tried to keep abreast of its work by using other devices, such as the disposition of motions without hearing, adoption of commissioners' opinions wherever appropriate, and the use of retired or assigned judges whenever they are available. Despite these efforts the court has continually fallen behind in the disposition of cases.

Hearings were held on this legislation on June 10, 1965, and these hearings indicated to the committee that the legislation was meritorious. As stated above, the legislation is sponsored by the Judicial Conference of the United States.

#### REMOVAL OF CIVIL ACTIONS FROM STATE TO FEDERAL COURTS

The bill (H.R. 3989) to extend to 30 days the time for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State to Federal courts was considered, ordered to be a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

##### PURPOSE

The purpose of H.R. 3989 is to extend from 20 to 30 days the time allowed under section 1446(b) of title 28, United States Code, for filing petitions for removal of civil actions from State courts to Federal courts.

##### STATEMENT

The facts and justification for this legislation are contained in House Report 132 on H.R. 3989, and are set forth as follows:

"This legislation was introduced at the request of the Judicial Conference of the United States. In a recent study, a subcommittee of the Judicial Conference Committee on Revision of the Laws concluded that the existing 20-day period for filing a petition for the removal of a civil action from a State court to a Federal court is too short to permit the removal of many actions as to which valid grounds of removal exist. In its letter to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts says in part as follows:

"The difficulty arises largely because of State provisions for substituted service on nonresident defendants by service on the secretary of state or other State officer as the agent of the nonresident. Where such substituted service is effected, there is frequently an understandable delay in procuring local counsel. By the time local counsel is obtained the 20 days for filing the removal petition frequently has run and the right to removal is thus lost. This is true particularly where an insurer assumes the defense and it is necessary for the defendant to turn the papers over to the insurer who in turn must forward them to local counsel. The time to answer after substituted service is in excess of 20 days in 30 States. In the majority of these States such time is 30 days, in others longer and in some shorter."

"The Department of Justice, in the 88th Congress, favorably reported with respect to identical legislation (H.R. 5906, 88th Cong.).

"The bill would simply amend subsection (b) of section 1446, title 28, United States Code, by striking out the word 'twenty' where it appears and substituting the word 'thirty', thereby extending by 10 days the period within which removal petitions may be filed."

After a review of all the foregoing, the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill, H.R. 3989, be considered favorably without amendment.

#### MYRA KNOWLES SNELLING

The bill (H.R. 4596) for the relief of Myra Knowles Snelling was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

##### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay \$7,500 to Myra Knowles Snelling in

full settlement of her claims and resulting disability sustained in 1955 when, as a child, she was leaving an Army chartered schoolbus and was struck by a car. The bill would further provide for a payment to her father of \$473.55 for unreimbursed medical expenses.

#### HEIRS AND DEVISEES OF FLY AND HER GROWTH, DECEASED LOWER BRULE INDIAN ALLOTTEES

The bill (S. 1049) to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

##### S. 1049

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 267, the sum of \$1,289.96 for distribution to the persons entitled thereto.*

Sec. 2. The heirs and devisees, immediate and remote, of Fly, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 266, are hereby relieved of all liability to reimburse the United States for any payments erroneously made to them representing revenues from the allotment of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, numbered 267: *Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

##### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to pay the sum of \$1,289.96 for distribution to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees, and to relieve from liability those who received erroneous payments.

#### IRENE McCAFFERTY

The bill (H.R. 1395) for the relief of Irene McCafferty was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

##### PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Mrs. Irene McCafferty of all liability to repay \$303.20, representing overpayment of salary made to her because of an administrative error from April 3, 1960, to June 9, 1963, while employed by the Maritime Administration in San Francisco, Calif. The bill provides for a refund of amounts repaid or withheld because of the liability.

#### JOHN ALLEN

The bill (H.R. 2694) for the relief of John Allen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT

##### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve John Allen of liability to repay \$1,035.79, the



amount of an overpayment of salary between January 10, 1960, and January 10, 1962, while he was employed by the Military Sea Transportation Service, and to authorize a refund to him of any amounts repaid by or collected from him in complete or partial satisfaction of the indebtedness.

**LT. (JG.) HAROLD EDWARD HENNING, U.S. NAVY**

The bill (H.R. 4603) for the relief of Lt. (Jg.) Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Lt. Harold Edward Henning, U.S. Navy, of Emporia, Kans., of liability to the United States in the amount of \$3,847.11, representing the total amount of overpayments of compensation paid to him by the U.S. Navy as the result of an administrative error in determining the amount of service that should be credited to him for pay purposes. Section 2 of this bill would pay to Lieutenant Henning an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section of the bill.

**SGT. DONALD R. HURRLE**

The bill (H.R. 5839) for the relief of Sgt. Donald R. Hurrle, U.S. Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve Sgt. Donald R. Hurrle, U.S. Marine Corps, of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$129.49, representing the amount of compensation earned by him during the period July 30 through August 8, 1963, as an employee of the Boston station of the El Cajon, Calif., post office when, through a misunderstanding, he continued his employment at the post office while officially in the Marine Corps on advance leave. The bill would also authorize a refund of any amounts withheld.

**CECIL GRAHAM**

The bill (H.R. 5902) for the relief of Cecil Graham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to waive the applicable limitations of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 and 1954 so as to permit the filing and consideration of a claim for refund by Cecil Graham, of Oklahoma City, Okla., for income taxes he erroneously paid on civil service retirement payments he received by reason of his disability retirement in the period from April 1, 1947, to November 15, 1955.

**MR. AND MRS. CHRISTIAN VOSS**

The bill (H.R. 7682) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Voss was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**NATIONAL FARMERS WEEK**

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the seven-day period beginning on the first Sunday of April in each year is hereby designated as National Farmers Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE**

The purpose of the joint resolution is to provide for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week, and the President is requested to issue annually a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

**STATEMENT**

The farmers of America are one of our Nation's greatest resources and assets. Directly and indirectly they are doing more and more for our country each year. While producing more and better food, America's farm families have been sending workers into other areas of the economy—into the professions, manufacturing, business, and the services. Our industrial development has been due in great measure to the increased food production, thereby substituting increased skills and technology for farmworkers.

One hundred years ago one farmworker supplied food and fiber for only five persons. Today 1 worker on 1 farm can supply food and fiber for nearly 30 persons. Farmers give the Nation a large share of their business in many diversified fields. They spend over \$2 billion a year for trucks, tractors, and other equipment. They use more petroleum than any other industry and over \$2 billion a year is spent for farm maintenance, fuel, and lubricants. It would take the people of North Dakota 6 years to use the kilowatt consumption needed by America's farms for just 1 year. The farm business creates millions of jobs for fellow Americans. Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising the products of agriculture. Over 6 million have jobs providing the supplies farmers use. Thousands in rural communities across the country make their livings providing services required by farmers.

Senate Joint Resolution 27 would in a small way recognize the work of these men, women, and children who live and work on the Nation's family farms. They who contribute so much to the wealth of America deserve the special week's recognition given them in this resolution.

Accordingly, the committee recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 27 without amendment.

**"DAY OF RECOGNITION" FOR  
FIREFIGHTERS**

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 86) to authorize the President to proclaim a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

**S.J. RES. 86**

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President*

is hereby authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating May 4 of each year as a "Day of Recognition" of the personal sacrifices and devotion to duty of firefighters in the United States of America in protecting lives and property in their communities; and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE**

The purpose of the joint resolution is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating May 4 of each year as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters.

**STATEMENT**

Our country's firemen are part of our American heritage since Benjamin Franklin first organized the volunteer fire brigade in 1736. The services of firefighters has withstood all the changes of time. The increasing population in county areas impels firemen to seek new ways to remind residents of the hazards found in homes which firemen must protect. A firefighters "Day of Recognition" will bring attention to the contributions that all firemen throughout the United States give to make all of our communities a safer place to live. By observing May 4 as a "Day of Recognition" for firefighters, our Nation will be firmly reminded of the efforts of these men, and it will provide all of our citizens with an opportunity to extend their thanks to them.

The committee, therefore, is of the opinion that this resolution has a meritorious purpose and, accordingly, recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 86, without amendment.

**NATIONAL TEACHERS' DAY**

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 90) to designate the 7th day of November in 1965 as "National Teachers' Day" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

**S.J. RES. 90**

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 7th day of November in 1965 is hereby designated as "National Teachers' Day," in appreciation of the dedicated services of the teachers of this country. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE**

The purpose of the joint resolution is to designate the 7th day of November in 1965 as "National Teachers' Day."

**STATEMENT**

National Teachers' Day is a fitting way to honor and praise the teachers of America. We honor their service, spirit, and dedication. No group contributes more importantly to the future of the United States.

Teachers play a vital role in training our youth today, to become the responsible citizen of tomorrow. They not only teach or instruct, but guide, encourage, and lead and this takes interest, understanding, and potent effort under often trying conditions.

Teachers frequently have provided the impetus to their students for further achievement and contribution to society. One

teacher, as in the case of President Johnson, can encourage a pupil and influence the shape of his future life. Many great Americans owe their first inspiration to their teachers.

It is imperative that this country have good schools. But our schools are only as good as our teachers. It is necessary to remind the citizens of this country of the contribution teachers make to the national welfare and to the growth of the individual child, although their contribution can never be sufficiently honored. Proclamation of National Teachers' Day is a small, yet tangible way to demonstrate our appreciation for all our teachers, the elementary, secondary, and college teachers, the teachers of the exceptional child and the teachers of vocational skills, who have done so much for America.

The committee believes it appropriate to give recognition to the spirit, dedication, and services rendered by the teachers of this country by accordingly designating the 7th day of November of this year as "National Teachers' Day." The committee, therefore, recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 90, without amendment.

### THE YEAR OF THE BIBLE

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 101) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the calendar year 1966 as "The Year of the Bible" was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 101

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation (1) designating the calendar year of 1966 as "The Year of the Bible", in recognition of the place of the Bible in the culture of our country and of the role performed by the American Bible Society in Bible translation, production, distribution, and reading; and (2) inviting the governments of States and communities and the people of the United States to observe such year with appropriate ceremonies and activities to the end that all our people may have a better knowledge and appreciation of the Holy Scriptures.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the preamble is agreed to.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of the joint resolution is to authorize and request the President of the United States to issue a proclamation designating the year of 1966 as "The Year of the Bible" in recognition of the place of the Bible in the culture of our country and of the role performed by the American Bible Society in Bible translation, production, distribution, and reading.

#### STATEMENT

The Bible has been a vital force in the lives of Americans for more than three centuries, and the tradition of Bible reading has been supported by the American Bible Society, a nonprofit, nondenominational organization, for the 150 years since its founding.

Following the American Revolution, the new Nation was largely without a supply of Bibles. Presses operating in the Old World had been cut off to America for 2 years. The few Bibles available were far too expensive for the majority of Americans to purchase them. People moving west often were forced to settle in areas without a church and without access to a Bible. Also, this was the age of the missionary. Those who

had gone overseas were pleading with their home offices to provide Bibles in the native tongues of the areas where they worked. Missionary translations lay unpublished for lack of funds and facilities to produce inexpensive editions. There was a great need for cooperation in meeting these problems, and the cooperative effort was begun with the founding of the American Bible Society in 1816 under the direction of Dr. Elias Boudinot, then president of the New Jersey Bible Society and a past president of the Continental Congress.

The goal of the society at that time and ever since has remained constant—to make the Scriptures available and meaningful everywhere. To this end the American Bible Society has donated Bibles to the personnel of our armed services and to the armed services of other nations. They have published Bibles in more than 500 languages, often making the Bible available in a specific language for the first time. For instance, portions of the Bible have been published recently in Bafia, Cashibo, and Ilongot. In this translation effort the American Bible Society has been joined by other Bible societies.

Prompted by a special concern for the blind, the society produces the Scriptures in braille and on recordings. They continue in all ways to do their best in meeting the challenges of the times—increasing secularism, newly literate peoples, and the Communist drive toward atheism. Their record of service is long and continuous.

Senate Joint Resolution 101 would serve as a tribute to the notable past achievements of the society, an incentive to present purposes, and an expression of confidence in the future of this distinguished organization.

The committee believes that this legislation has a meritorious purpose and accordingly recommends favorable consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 101, without amendment.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, speaking both as a Senator from Rhode Island and as a vice president of the American Bible Society, I wish to record at this time my great satisfaction in the Senate's approval today of my resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 101, which authorizes and requests the President to proclaim the calendar year 1966 as "The Year of the Bible."

This resolution would provide official, and I believe most appropriate, commemoration of the 150 years of nonprofit, nondenominational work by the American Bible Society in publishing and distributing the Bible throughout the world. Starting in an era when the society was in many instances the sole agent for supplying the Bible on the expanding frontier of the United States, the American Bible Society now has grown into an immense publishing and distribution house for a worldwide readership. Last year, the society distributed over 25 million publications in the United States and over 48 million abroad. In 1964 it published at least some part of the Bible in 1,232 languages.

The universal, pervasive influence of the society has been widely recognized for many years. Both President Johnson and President Kennedy consented to serve as honorary chairmen of the Society, as did Presidents Eisenhower, Truman, and Roosevelt before them. Now, it seems to me especially appropriate that this tradition of public and official commemoration be given special

emphasis as we mark a century and a half of service by this great organization. It is especially timely that Congress act now to authorize the commemoration in order that preparations be made now to designate 1966 as the "Year of the Bible." I do hope our colleagues in the House will be able to take similar action soon.

### REMOVAL OF CERTAIN RESTRICTIONS ON THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL OF PARIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9877) to amend the act of January 30, 1913, as amended, to remove certain restrictions on the American Hospital of Paris which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, on page 1, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 9 of said Act is amended by striking out: "Provided, That at no time shall said corporation hold real estate except for the necessary use of office and hospital purposes of said hospital".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT

The amendment is recommended by the Department of State. The purpose of the amendment is to remove the limitation contained in the charter restricting the American Hospital's general power to hold real estate for general investment purposes.

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to remove two limitations in the basic charter of the American Hospital of Paris pertaining to total value of property which the American Hospital of Paris may own, and removing the limitation on the hospital's general power to hold real estate for general investment purposes.

#### STATEMENT

The American Hospital of Paris was granted a Federal charter by act of Congress in 1913. The purpose of the corporation was "to establish, maintain, and conduct in the city of Paris, Republic of France . . . a hospital to furnish . . . medical and surgical aid and care to the citizens of the United States of America . . ."

For over 50 years the hospital has served the American community in France and Americans traveling in Europe. Since World War II it has provided medical services to U.S. Armed Forces for the use of military patients.

The hospital is a nonprofit institution, without any governmental or other subsidy whatsoever. Its income is derived from charges to patients, donations, and the return on its endowment. American patients are admitted on a priority basis irrespective of their ability to pay the hospital charges. American indigent patients are given free care.

The hospital is supervised by a board of governors, composed of 20 members, all of whom must be American citizens. The American Ambassador to France is the honorary president of the board.

The charter which Congress granted in 1913 contained a limitation of \$2 million on the value of property which the hospital could own (37 Stat. 654). The limitation was subsequently increased to its present



ceiling of \$8 million in 1929 (46 Stat. 11). Since 1929, property values have risen, the hospital's facilities have expanded and costs of operation have increased. Thus, the hospital is in need of maintaining a larger amount of assets to increase its income. The committee has concluded that the present charter limitation unduly and unnecessarily restricts the hospital's present and future ability to fulfill its purposes. The elimination of all restrictions on the value of assets which the hospital may own appears more practical than merely raising the permissible limit. In this respect the bill would conform this charter to those recently granted by the Congress.

The committee is advised that it is the policy of the hospital to invest its endowment funds and to purchase items of hospital equipment whenever possible in the United States. Thus, the bill is not likely to have any significant adverse balance-of-payments consequence.

The provision in section 9 of the hospital's charter forbidding it to hold real estate as an investment, was imposed in 1913 for the same reasons as the asset limitation in section 2 and in logic it falls with that section. The original debates in the House of Representatives as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date show that both limitations were adopted out of a mistaken fear that the corporation might be used to accumulate property for the purpose of avoiding the payment of State, real estate, and income taxes. Such fears have, of course, been proven unjustified, and the hospital's 50 years of public service surely belie the notion that it will be used for tax avoidance.

The hospital might be bequeathed real estate which is not immediately utilizable for hospital purposes but which, for various reasons, could not be immediately sold. Under the present restriction in section 9 of the charter, it might be maintained that the hospital could not even accept a bequest of real estate unless the real estate could be utilized directly and at once for hospital purposes.

It also seems undesirable to restrict the hospital's general power to hold real estate for general investment purposes. In the event that there were a substantial bequest to the hospital in French francs or other foreign currency, which could not readily be converted into dollars and, therefore, had to be invested locally, it might very well be that real estate would be a safer and more prudent investment than, for example, purchase of securities on the Paris Bourse. Most European equity securities have traditionally extremely low yields. Certainly over the last 10 years, sophisticated investors in France have preferred real estate investments, and their judgment has been justified. Real estate values have risen very substantially, whereas the value of French stocks and bonds has tended to decrease rather than increase.

Such a restriction on real estate holdings would appear inappropriate in the case of endowed institutions in the United States. The American Hospital should be permitted to follow the same kind of flexible investment program, and, to the extent that it had to have foreign investments, should be able to follow European investment patterns, rather than be obliged to invest in low-yield foreign securities.

The committee is of the view that the American Hospital of Paris has performed and is performing valuable services for Americans abroad. Accordingly, the committee recommends the enactment of the legislation.

#### WARREN F. COLEMAN, JR.

The bill (S. 331) for the relief of Warren F. Coleman, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading,

read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 331

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Warren F. Coleman, Junior, an employee of the Department of the Air Force, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$1,253.07, representing the amount of overpayments of salary received by the said Warren F. Coleman, Junior, for the period from July 10, 1955, through February 24, 1962, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Warren F. Coleman, Junior, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of this legislation is to relieve Warren F. Coleman, Jr., of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$1,253.07, representing an overpayment of salary received by him from the Department of the Air Force.

#### F. F. HINTZE

The bill (S. 337) for the relief of F. F. Hintze was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 337

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That F. F. Hintze, 112 University Street, Salt Lake City, Utah, is relieved of all liability to the United States with respect to accrued rentals in the amount of \$1,280.00 claimed to be due the United States under oil and gas lease, serial Cheyenne 066038.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve the claimant, F. F. Hintze, of all liability to the United States with respect to accrued rentals of \$1,280 due the United States under oil and gas lease Cheyenne 066038.

#### MARY F. MORSE

The bill (S. 577) for the relief of Mary F. Morse, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 577

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Mary F. Morse, an employee of the Department of the Army, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$7,301.36, representing the amount of overpayments of salary received by the said Mary F. Morse for the period from July 2, 1963, through October 20, 1964, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Mary F. Morse, referred to in the first section of this Act, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from her on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to relieve Mary F. Morse, an employee of the Department of the Army, of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$7,301.36, representing the amount of overpayments of salary received by the said Mary F. Morse for the period from July 2, 1963, through October 20, 1964, as a result of administrative error. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

#### BETTY H. GOING

The bill (H.R. 1221) for the relief of Betty H. Going was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay \$4,718.44 to Betty H. Going in full settlement of her claims against the United States for the proceeds of a life insurance policy of the Guardian International Life Insurance Co., of Dallas, Tex., in which she was named as the alternate beneficiary, issued on the life of her brother, the late Sgt. Walker D. Howle, which policy lapsed because of the nonpayment of premiums by the Government in accordance with an allotment.

#### EFSTAHIA GIANNOS

The bill (H.R. 2926) for the relief of Efsthia Giannos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien adopted child of a U.S. citizen.

#### KIM JAI SUNG

The bill (H.R. 2933) for the relief of Kim Jai Sung was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien child to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The bill waives the limitation of two orphan petitions.

#### SON CHUNG JA

The bill (H.R. 3062) for the relief of Son Chung Ja was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an alien child adopted by citizens of the United States.

**MRS. ANTONIO DE OYARZABAL**

The bill (H.R. 3337) for the relief of Mrs. Antonio de Oyarzabal was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE OF THE BILL**

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to transmit U.S. citizenship to her daughters.

**MISS ROSA BASILE DESANTIS**

The bill (H.R. 3765) for the relief of Miss Rosa Basile DeSantis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE OF THE BILL**

The purpose of the bill is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of the alien adopted daughter of a U.S. citizen.

**RELIEF OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE AIR FORCE**

The bill (H.R. 5252) to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to validate payments of basic allowance for subsistence to enlisted members of the Air Force who were assigned to Tainan Air Force Station, Tainan, Taiwan, during the period October 1, 1960, to June 30, 1962, which were subsequently held to have been based upon erroneous determination that a Government mess was not available and that it was impractical for the Government to furnish subsistence in Tainan.

**WILLIAM C. PAGE**

The bill (H.R. 5903) for the relief of William C. Page was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay William C. Page the sum of \$2,342 in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for amounts due him as a U.S. commissioner for the U.S. District Court of the Western District of Oklahoma, for services rendered between August 31, 1963, and February 10, 1964.

**AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRET SERVICE AGENTS TO MAKE ARRESTS**

The bill (H.R. 6294) to authorize Secret Service agents to make arrests without warrant for offenses committed in their presence, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend section 3056 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to authorize members of the U.S. Secret Service to make arrests without warrants for any offense against the United States committed in their

presence or for any felony cognizable under the laws of the United States if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing such a felony.

**CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS**

The bill (H.R. 7090) for the relief of certain individuals was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to relieve 14 named individuals of liability to repay certain per diem payments made to them while they were stationed at the Fleet Air Western Pacific Repair Activity, Tokyo, and Osaka, Japan, and were assigned as military inspection representatives at civilian contractors' plants.

**KENT A. HERATH**

The bill (H.R. 8212) for the relief of Kent A. Herath was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Kent A. Herath \$676 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of certain personal property from his official residence in David, Panama, where he was serving as U.S. Information Service branch public affairs officer.

**RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES**

The bill (H.R. 8352) for the relief of certain employees of the Foreign Service of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE**

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay Edward H. Brown, \$2,240; Anna J. Bryant, \$1,625; Ronald G. Dixon, \$211; John J. MacDougall, \$1,465; Rene A. Tron, \$1,500; in full settlement of their claims against the United States for compensation for personal property lost while performing their official duties as employees of the Foreign Service of the United States while serving in overseas areas.

**AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1924) to amend section 39(b) of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "b"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last sentence of paragraph b of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67b) is amended to read as follows:*

"Active part-time referees, and referees receiving benefits under paragraph (1) of subdivision d of section 40 of this Act, shall not practice as counsel or attorney or act as

trustee or receiver in any proceeding under this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE**

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act.

**STATEMENT**

The bill was introduced at the request of the Judicial Conference of the United States. The bill is recommended by the Department of Justice.

In its favorable report on the bill the Department of Justice pointed out:

"A referee in bankruptcy has the responsibility of determining the disposition to be made of property whereas a trustee or receiver acts in a fiduciary capacity to receive, collect, and preserve property and funds. The bill would prevent referees from acting as trustees or receivers in bankruptcy proceedings. As a matter of ethics, policy, and good practice, and to avoid a conflict of interest a referee should not be appointed a trustee or receiver."

The committee believes that the bill is meritorious and recommends it favorably.

**GABRIEL A. NAHAS AND OTHERS**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 405) for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas, Vera Nahas, Albert Gabriel Nahas, and Frederika-Maria Nehas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the periods of time Gabriel A. Nahas and Vera Nahas have resided in the United States since their lawful admission for permanent residence on March 2, 1960, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Gabriel A. Nahas and Vera Nahas."

**EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT****PURPOSE OF THE BILL**

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiaries, who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on March 2, 1960, to file petitions for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents. The names of the minor children were deleted in accordance with the suggestion of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, inasmuch as they will derive U.S. citizenship after their parents are naturalized.

**YASUO TSUKIKAWA**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2039) for the relief of Yasuo Tsukikawa which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "Yasuo Tsukikawa" and insert "Ken Allen Keene



(Yasuo Tsukikawa)"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 205(c), relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of eligible orphans, shall be inapplicable in the case of a petition filed in behalf of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa) by Mr. and Mrs. C. D. Keene, citizens of the United States.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ken Allen Keene (Yasuo Tsukikawa)."

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to facilitate the entry into the United States in a nonquota status of an eligible orphan adopted by citizens of the United States, by waiving the limitation of two orphan petitions.

TO RENDER IMMUNE FROM LEGAL  
PROCESSES CERTAIN SIGNIFI-  
CANT IMPORTED CULTURAL OB-  
JECTS

The bill (S. 2273) to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) whenever any work of art or other object of cultural significance is imported into the United States from any foreign country, pursuant to an agreement entered into between the foreign owner or custodian thereof and the United States or one or more cultural or educational institutions within the United States providing for the temporary exhibition or display thereof within the United States at any cultural exhibition, assembly, activity, or festival administered, operated, or sponsored, without profit, by any such cultural or educational institution, no court of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States may issue or enforce any judicial process, or enter any judgment, decree, or order, for the purpose or having the effect of depriving such institution, or any carrier engaged in transporting such work or object within the United States, of custody or control of such object if before the importation of such object the President or his designee has determined that such object is of cultural significance and that the temporary exhibition or display thereof within the United States is in the national interest, and a notice to that effect has been published in the Federal Register.*

(b) If in any judicial proceeding in any such court any such process, judgment, decree, or order is sought, issued, or entered, the United States attorney for the judicial district within which such proceeding is pending shall be entitled as of right to intervene as a party to that proceeding, and upon request made by either the institution adversely affected, or upon direction by the Attorney General if the United States is adversely affected, shall apply to such court for the denial, quashing, or vacating thereof.

(c) Nothing contained in this Act shall preclude (1) any judicial action for or in aid of the enforcement of the terms of any such agreement or the enforcement of the obligation of any carrier under any contract for the transportation of any such object of cultural significance; or (2) the institution or prosecution by or on behalf of any such institution or the United States of any action for or in aid of the fulfillment of any obligation assumed by such institution or the United States pursuant to any such agreement.

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT  
PURPOSE

The purpose of the bill is to provide a process to render immune from seizure under judicial process certain objects of cultural significance imported into the United States for temporary display or exhibition, and to provide machinery to achieve this objective.

STATEMENT

This proposed legislation will permit organizations and institutions engaged in non-profit activities to import, on a temporary basis, works of art and objects of cultural significance from foreign countries for exhibit and display, without the risk of the seizure or attachment of the said objects by judicial process.

Both the Departments of State and Justice urge favorable consideration of the bill.

As pointed out in the report of the Department of State in its report on S. 2273—

"The bill is consistent with the Department's policy to assist and encourage educational and cultural interchange. Its enactment would be a significant step in international cooperation in this year which has been proclaimed by the President as International Cooperation Year.

"The Department of State is informed that both the Smithsonian Institution and the American Association of Museums support this legislation."

The Department of Justice, in its communication, states:

"The commendable objective of this legislation is to encourage the exhibition in the United States of objects of cultural significance which, in the absence of assurances such as are contained in the legislation, would not be made available."

The bill requires that the President of the United States or his designee, make a determination that the objects sought to be imported for exhibition or display are of such cultural significance as to be in the national interest, and publish notice to this effect in the Federal Register. Then, in the event that any judicial proceeding is instituted in any court of the United States, any State, the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession of the United States, the U.S. attorney for the judicial district shall be entitled, as a matter of right, to intervene as a party, and upon request made by either the institution adversely affected, or upon direction by the Attorney General that the United States is adversely affected, shall apply to such court for the denial, quashing, or vacating of such proceeding. Judicial action for or in aid of the enforcement of the terms of any agreement or the enforcement of the obligation of any carrier under any contract for the transportation of any such object of cultural significance is excepted from the immunity and the institution bringing in the objects of art or the United States is authorized to maintain a court action for or in the aid of the fulfillment of any obligation assumed by such institution or the United States pursuant to any such agreement.

The committee is of the opinion that the purposes of this proposed legislation are salutary and will contribute to the educational and cultural development of the people of the United States. It is, therefore,

recommended that S. 2273 be favorably considered.

BILLS PASSED OVER

During the call of the Calendar the following bills were passed over at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 1407, for the relief of Frank E. Lipp.

S. 1898, for the relief of certain aliens.

The following bill was passed over at the request of Mr. DIRKSEN:

H.R. 6726, for the relief of William S. Perrigo.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That concludes the call of the Calendar.

LET US OPEN THE DOOR OF OUR  
IMMIGRATION POLICY

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the enactment of the immigration bill now before the Senate will be a great landmark in the development of the American dream of the freedom and equality of all men. No provision of any national law is more distasteful to millions of Americans than the concept of judging the worth of men and women for immigration on the basis of their place of birth or the nationality of their parents.

I am proud to be a cosponsor in the Senate of the administration immigration bill. This historic legislation should be termed the "Celler immigration bill" in honor of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, EMANUEL CELLER, who more than any other Member of the Congress is responsible for the fact that this legislative proposal is now before the U.S. Senate for debate and vote and will be enacted into law in the near future. Chairman CELLER deserves the gratitude of all Americans for his outstanding leadership in successfully guiding this important legislative proposal through his committee in the face of powerful opposition from those who sought to delay, to undermine and to render ineffective and useless the effort to build a proper immigration policy. It is a fact that mischiefmakers did to some small degree change the original administration proposal but they failed in their devious purpose to destroy the spirit and intent of this bill. Of course, today those very same obstructionists claim credit for this beneficial legislation.

We are the Nation which chiseled on our beautiful Statue of Liberty:

Give me your tired, your poor,  
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,

The wretched refuse of your teeming shores,  
Send them, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me

I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

The only justification that can be made for the national origins quota system is the claim that Americans with English or German or Irish names make better citizens than Americans of Italian, Greek, Polish or Hungarian descent. This concept is utterly false. It contradicts all our traditions and ideals, and makes a mockery of the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal.

This bill will make law the fact that each immigrant has a special worth by

reason of his potential contribution to our country and he should be judged on his individual ability and worth. Under the proposed bill, people would be admitted on the basis of their skills, education, and training. Another prime governing factor will be the reunification of families now separated by our outmoded immigration laws. It would put an end to painful case histories such as that of the naturalized Greek who is able to bring a maid from Ireland in short order, but who must wait many years to bring his mother or sister from Greece.

As President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in Boston in one of the closing speeches of his final campaign in 1944:

All of our people all over the country—except the pure-blooded Indians—are immigrants or descendants of immigrants, including even those who came over here on the Mayflower.

It was through the open door of its immigration policy that the vast empty space of the United States was peopled during the 19th century. That door was narrowed to a slot when Congress imposed national quotas under the Quota Act of 1921, which stacked the cards in favor of the people of Northern and Western Europe, and to the prejudice of nationals of other areas of the world.

The Celler immigration bill will right the wrong that stains our national conscience and blurs our image as the greatest and best democracy in the entire world. It does not ask of a prospective immigrant, "What country are you from?", but rather, "What can you do for the United States of America?"

This legislative proposal recognizes that each immigrant has a special worth because of his potential contribution to the total manpower of our country. It will eliminate all quotas based on national origin. The total amount of immigrants admitted each year will not be greatly increased.

Mr. President, the enactment of this bill will at long last commit us to a national policy which will make real the simple truth of the words of St. Paul: "God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth."

#### LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a morning hour, with a time limitation of 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REQUIREMENT OF PERFORMANCE BONDS RELATING TO CERTAIN CONTRACTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to require that contracts for construction, alteration, or repair of any public building or public work of the District of Columbia be ac-

companied by a performance bond protecting the District of Columbia and by an additional bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H.R. 2414. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey certain lands situated in the State of Oregon to the city of Roseburg, Oreg.; (Rept. No. 754).

By Mr. EASTLAND (for Mr. Long of Missouri), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1758. A bill to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies; (Rept. No. 755).

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2543. A bill for the relief of Dr. Maria Yolanda Rafaela Miranda y Monteagudo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2544. A bill for the relief of Kumari Hellen and Kumari Sonamani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S. 2545. A bill for the relief of Jose Eleuterio Branco Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—AMENDMENTS

##### AMENDMENT NO. 457

Mr. ALLOTT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 458

Mr. THURMOND submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2580, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The Chair announces that on today, September 17, 1965, the Vice President signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 8469) to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DAVID G. BRESS TO BE U.S. ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a pub-

lic hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, September 21, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of David G. Bress, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. attorney, for the District of Columbia, for a term of 4 years, vice David C. Acheson.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself, as chairman.

#### NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK MOREY COFFIN TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, FIRST CIRCUIT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, September 24, 1965, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frank Morey Coffin, of Maine, to be U.S. circuit judge, First Circuit, vice John P. Hartigan, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

#### NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward C. Sweeney, of Illinois, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for a term of 5 years expiring August 9, 1970.

John W. Mahan, of Montana, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, for a term expiring March 4, 1970, vice Francis Adams Cherry.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, September 24, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

#### VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S ADDRESS TO THE CLASS OF 1965, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suppose there are few former Members of Congress who have had a happier, more constructive and positive relationship with Congress than the present Vice President, HUBERT HUMPHREY. He recently addressed the class of 1965 at Syracuse University. I have a copy of the speech which he delivered at that time.



At a time when Congress is suffering the brickbats of criticism as it rarely has in the past, in spite of its constructive achievements, I believe that this address of the Vice President should be called to the attention of all Senators and the country.

Vice President HUMPHREY points out a series of constructive contributions which Congress makes.

First, he says—and this is something which is overlooked:

Few persons can deal directly with either the President or the Supreme Court. But any person, personally or by mail or phone, can communicate with his elected Representatives in Washington. The Members of the Congress, the people's Representatives, provide a direct link between the National Government, this huge structure that shows no signs of becoming smaller or less complicated.

Mr. President, the Vice President points out further the enormous educational value of serving in Congress. He states:

My teachers have been Presidents and department heads, constituents, press, radio and television, and above all a group of wise and distinguished colleagues in both Houses.

Then he points to the constructive achievement of compromise and of achieving a consensus on the basis of a constructive dialog, and he invites attention to the role of Congress for responsible surveillance of the many departments of Government, what he calls a continuing critical review, constructively critical by the committees and the Houses of Congress.

The Vice President then invites attention to the joy of politics. I do not know of anyone who has participated in the joy of politics to the obvious extent that our distinguished Vice President has.

The Vice President concludes with a fine quotation from Emerson:

It was Emerson who once wrote that Congress is a "standing insurrection." You don't need a revolution here; you have one built in. It is a standing insurrection against the ancient enemies of mankind: war, and poverty, and ignorance, and injustice, and sickness, environmental ugliness, and economic and personal insecurity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS TO THE CLASS OF 1965, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, BY HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

WILLIAM PEARSON TOLLEY. We're singularly honored today to have so distinguished a guest. Because students are important at Syracuse University we consult each year with the officers of the senior class and ask them their choice of a commencement speaker. And this morning, ladies and gentlemen, by the unanimous action of the senior class, the Vice President of the United States.

Vice President HUMPHREY. Thank you, thank you, Chancellor Tolley. My thanks to you, Chancellor Tolley, deans of the many schools, colleges of this great university, members of the board of trustees, my colleagues in Government who share this platform with me today, Secretary Connor, a graduate of this splendid university, and

Secretary Harlan Cleveland, a former professor and head of the Maxwell School of this great university, Congressman HANLEY, the graduates of this class of 1965, the parents who are here in pride and honor, and my fellow Americans, and guests; this is, as I've been reminded once again, as you have, the 111th commencement ceremony, not for me but for this great university. I was saying to Chancellor Tolley how difficult it is these days to be the commencement speaker and try to find a topic that is worthy of the attention and the thoughtful consideration of the graduates. I suppose I should be concerned about the faculty, but in this instance I address myself primarily to the graduates.

The honor that you have done to me today is one that is deeply appreciated, particularly in light of the announcement that has just been made as to how I was selected. I'm especially delighted that the chancellor and the board of trustees extended their invitation to me as a result of the vote of the senior class. You see, I've always been friendly to votes. And I'm particularly pleased when the votes and the voters are friendly to me. And what a refreshing experience, and what a way to renew the spirit of a public official, to be selected once again by votes. I might say to my friends of the graduating class, I have been on both ends of the voting spectrum, and the best end is the winning one. Now I, of course, have no way of knowing against whom I was running in this contest. But I trust that it was some worthy Republican, of which this State has all too many. I hope that I didn't inspire any fear or trepidation in the heart of the Congressman.

I do want to take just for this moment the opportunity to express, a little bit prematurely, but this is one way of assuring that the ceremony comes off, my thanks for the honor that will be bestowed upon several of us here today, the honorary degrees. Now having made the announcement, there is no way that anything can go wrong.

My presence here today is particularly satisfying to me because this year marks the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Maxwell School. Syracuse University has made many contributions to scholarship and to professional excellence in a wide variety of fields. I know that this great university encompasses most all of the disciplines of intellectual life. I'm well aware of the achievements and the high standards of your college of engineering, and I well recall that only last year the President of the United States was with you on the occasion of the dedication of your new communications building. I know the outstanding endeavors of this university in the field of social work and social welfare. These are but a few of your achievements in the field of scholarship and professional excellence.

But as one who has by purpose and design devoted his life to the public service, I want to express my personal thanks and gratitude of the U.S. Government for the work of the Maxwell School. Yes, I've mentioned already the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, a distinguished former dean of the Maxwell School, Harlan Cleveland, who serves his country well and faithfully and with brilliance, and the graduate of this great university, the Secretary of Commerce, who has brought new life to that Department and a new sense of purpose and direction. In addition to the outstanding contributions of the Maxwell School to social science scholarship and the upgrading of public service, its undergraduate course in public affairs and citizenship is world famous. And I would recommend it to every great university in our land. Your chancellor has told me that more than 20,000 Syracuse undergraduates have taken this course over the past generation. Think of it, 20,000 citizens who have been educated in their continuing personal

responsibilities for the preservation and the extension of human freedom—and if ever there was a time that this Nation needed men and women who understand their personal responsibilities to the cause of freedom and social justice, it is now.

Our Nation, as never before, bears the mantle of leadership, and that mantle is not a luxury, but rather a responsibility, a burden and a duty. All the more reason then that citizens, not just the leaders, but citizens all be educated in their continuing personal responsibilities for the stewardship of human freedom. It is difficult to think of a more fundamental contribution which a university can make to free society. So my congratulations to this school. I know that it will continue to flourish and accomplish much in the years ahead.

Now, I am also a refugee from the classroom, a former university teacher. Because of the precarious nature of elective life, I like to mention this in the presence of trustees and deans of faculty. And I would care not to be judged entirely on the singular performance of today, but rather on a longer exposition by the applicant at a later time.

I am well aware, as a former teacher, of the pitfalls of commencement speeches. It's so easy to follow the timeworn formula, the world is in a mess (when wasn't it, by the way?), the older generation has failed (it generally has), and it's up to you of the graduating class to put things right, at least for a day or two. And then someday you'll be the older generation and you too can have the dubious honors that other commencement speakers would heap upon you. But platitudes rarely change attitudes. And baneful criticism and vapid exhortations are cheap substitutes for hard thought and analysis. I prefer, therefore, to take my stand on the proposition that the American people working through democratic institutions, changing institutions, have met, are meeting, and will continue to meet the most complex problems of our age. If we still have a long way to go, and we have in achieving human equality, in securing international and domestic tranquility, in extending the benefits of our technical genius to all citizens in the American Republic and to all of mankind, let us at least glory in and be inspired by the magnitude of the unfinished agenda. Let us glory in the fact that we still possess the wit and the wisdom to continue making our American democratic system responsive to the terribly difficult and complex problems of this turbulent and rapidly changing age.

Winston Churchill once was reported to have said that democracy is the worst form of government, except all others. And I suppose there is more truth than humor in that analysis of the social structure. But it is our democracy that we mold and design to our purpose. And the glory of the democracy and of the democratic faith is the courage of it, the experimentation of it, and the willingness to try to begin anew, if we should fail, to rise once again, if we should falter, to try once again, remembering with the prophet that the longest journey is the first step, and the first steps toward freedom we have taken, and further steps we will take.

I want to discuss with this graduating class the importance of one of the great constitutional instruments at the disposal of the American people in the business of making this democracy work. I want to discuss with you an institution that is frequently referred to with cynicism, all too often, may I say, by the media, and all too often held in disrepute by people who know all too little about it. I refer to the institution of the Congress of the United States. What I have to say I think needs saying, because too many of our citizens take an indifferent, cynical and even hostile view toward the legislative branch. No one branch has a monopoly on wisdom or virtue, but surely each can make a contribution to the common good. This is not, when I speak of the Congress, to under-

estimate the need for strong and able presidential leadership, or for wise and humane judicial decisions. It is, however, once again to reaffirm the vital role of representative government, the vital role of the Congress in our constitutional system. Few persons can deal directly with either the President or the Supreme Court. But any person, personally or by mail or phone, can communicate with his elected representatives in Washington. The Members of the Congress, the people's representatives, provide a direct link between the National Government, this huge structure that shows no signs of becoming smaller or less complicated, this huge structure and the almost 195 million persons who comprise this Republic, and a growing population it is. Surely, this contact, this connection, is vital in keeping our National Government responsive to the needs and opinions of the American people.

I have found congressional service to be a remarkable form of higher education. It's a super graduate school in every discipline. My teachers have been Presidents and department heads, constituents, press, radio, and television, and above all a group of wise and distinguished colleagues in both Houses. I cannot in the few minutes that I have convey to you all that I have learned from these teachers, but it is a rich and rewarding experience.

Perhaps I can suggest some lessons in democratic theory and practice which I've gained from my collegial experiences in the Congress. The first lesson has to do with the creative and constructive dimension to the process of compromise—compromise without the loss of principle or honor. There are 100 Members of the U.S. Senate and 435 Members of the House. They come from States and districts as diverse as Nevada and New York, Alaska and Alabama. No two States or regions of the United States have identical needs, backgrounds, interests, or even prejudices. And one of the jobs of the Congress is to reconcile such differences through the process of compromise and accommodation. What sometimes seem to the naive and untutored eye to be legislative obstructionisms, often are no more than the honest expressions of dedicated representatives trying to make clear the attitudes and the interests of their States and regions, sometimes trying to gain time for public understanding of vital issues. As Sir Richard Grenfell once observed: "Mankind is slowly learning that because two men differ neither need be wicked."

From the earliest days of this Republic—at the Constitutional Convention—the leaders of this Nation have maintained an unswerving commitment to moderation. Now, if our Founding Fathers had not understood the need to overcome extremes in drafting our Constitution, this noble experiment of ours in the art of self-government would surely have foundered years ago on the rocks of dissension and discord.

As in the deliberations of the Constitutional Convention, the heart of congressional activity are skills of negotiation, of honest bargaining among equals. My willingness to compromise, and I have done so more times than I can count, is the respect that I pay to the dignity of those with whom I disagree. Yes, I have come to the conclusion that possibly all of my original suggestions may not have been right. There may be others, you know, who have solid and constructive views. Dogma and doctrine have little place in a society in which there is respect for the attitude and the opinion of others.

Through reasonable discussion, through taking into account the view of many, Congress amends and refines the legislative proposals so that once a law is passed it reflects the collective judgment of a diverse people. This is consensus, the word that is used so much in these days. Consensus is nothing

but agreement, obtained by a constructive dialog between persons of different points of view, based upon mutual respect and understanding. Surely this is a remarkable service for a people that aspire to orderly progress. Surely the habits of accommodation and compromise are of universal consequence. These are the very skills and attitudes so desperately needed on the larger stage of world conflict, and possibly our difficulties on that world stage can be better understood when we recognize that where there are despotic forms of government or dictatorships, the art of negotiation and compromise has been sacrificed to power, to arrogance, and to the strong will of the man who knows he is right. We possibly have some teaching to do before the processes of peace may reach a maturity and an achievement.

World order and the rule of law will be secure on this earth only when men have learned to cope with the continuing conflicts of peoples and nations through the peaceful processes of bargaining and negotiation. And might I admonish my fellow Americans that we too need to be cognizant of the differences in other lands, that we seek no *pax Americana*, we seek no trademark "Made in the U.S.A." we seek above all to negotiate, to accommodate, to adjust so that peoples realize their hopes in their way.

A second lesson that I have learned from my congressional teachers is the importance of the congressional role of responsible surveillance. There are roughly 70 separate departments and agencies in the Federal Government. Now if you should notice two Cabinet officers wince a bit, as I speak of congressional surveillance, may I say that I have not been long from the Chambers of the Congress. I am not fully purified as yet in the executive climate. There are roughly 70 departments, some are small, some are large. All are engaged, however, in doing what they believe is carrying out the will of the people as expressed by the Congress.

In the interest of efficiency, economy, and responsiveness, these departments and agencies need, even if they don't want it, a continuing critical review, constructively critical it is to be hoped, by the committees and the Houses of Congress. The genius of our Founding Fathers is nowhere more in evidence than in that section of those sections of the Constitution which provide for checks and balances. Uncomfortable as those checks and balances may be sometimes to those who seek to administer, through its review of the executive budget, in the appropriations process, yes, through committee and subcommittee investigations, through advice and consent on appointments and treaties, and through informal discussion, Congress seeks to improve and to support the executive branch of our Government. My fellow Americans, I know that this cross-examination can be interpreted in other lands as division in our ranks, but it appears to me that it is more important that the American people know what is being done in their country, that they have the opportunity to reflect upon the policies and the decisions that are to be made, than it is that we should always have the image abroad of having a sort of monolith mind. I am not that worried. Let those who feel that we may discuss too often and that we may argue too much, let them remember that freedom is hammered out on the anvil of discussion, dissent, and debate, which ultimately yields to a decision that can be supported by the public.

This exercise in congressional freedom protects and extends personal freedom. And that is our goal. If legislative voices are occasionally strident, and they are, citizens should take stock of what their world would be like if no legislative voices were heard at all.

We know what happens in countries without independent and constructively analytical legislatures. Mankind invented a word for such systems centuries ago, and the word is as old as its practice—tyranny.

There's one other lesson that I've learned from my congressional teachers: the creative joy of politics. I can say in personal testimony that I would not give my life to it unless I found in it a sense of fulfillment and joy. Each Congress is devoted in substantial measure to the development of new public policies designed, as our Constitution says, to promote the general welfare and provide for the common defense, the national security of this Nation.

Congress is not a battlefield for blind armies that clash by night; it is a public forum operating in the light of day for men of reason. It is a place where national objectives are sought, where presidential programs are reviewed, where great societies are endlessly debated and implemented. Oh yes, I know at times the congressional process exasperates and confounds us, it's clumsy, sometimes it's slow and unresponsive to what some of us believe is urgent need. Its strength and its weakness is the fact that it is representative of our country, of our human institutions. It reveals in its conduct and makeup all of the crosscurrent of social, economic, and political forces. It is like a huge mirror suspended over the Nation, reflecting and revealing us for what we are, dirty face and all at times, our prejudices as well as our ideals, our fears and our hopes, our poverty and our wealth. There it is in the Congress representative of the people. Oh, to be sure, we should seek to constantly improve its rules and its institutions of operating machinery, but ultimately, my fellow Americans, the Congress will behave as the Nation behaves, the Congress will represent the spirit of the American people.

It was Emerson who once wrote that Congress is a "standing insurrection." You don't need a revolution here; you have one built in. It is a standing insurrection against the ancient enemies of mankind: war and poverty and ignorance and injustice and sickness, environmental ugliness, and economic and personal insecurity.

Now, graduates of this class, few careers offer such remarkable opportunities for translating dreams into reality. Congressman HANLEY, I am not seeking opposition to you, I am merely encouraging this group of fine graduates to take a new interest in the affairs of state, in Government, in public life. A new bill, a creative amendment, a wise appropriation, may mean the difference to this generation and generations ahead, between health and sickness, jobs and idleness, peace and war for millions of human beings.

And stemming from ancient parliamentary origins, the main job of Congress is to redress the grievances, to right the wrongs, to make freedom and justice living realities for all. What higher calling, I ask you, exists than this? This is the essence of politics: to translate the concerns and the creative responses of a vast citizenry into effective and humane laws. And, I submit, no country does it better than ours. Our competence in the field of self-government is the envy of mankind.

I cannot conclude without a personal note. For almost 20 years, Congress has been my home. As Vice President, my relationships with my former colleagues are inevitably a bit more formal and more intermittent than in past years. Yet I can say unashamedly that I cherish them dearly. I have seen their weakness and they have seen mine.

I have been on occasion restive of delays and procedural anachronisms—and so have they. But I have seen in the Halls of Congress more idealism, more humaneness, more compassion, more profiles of courage than in any other institution that I have ever known.



And like many of you today, I find in my heart to praise and to thank my teachers.

Perhaps some of these words of tribute to the institution of freedom known as the U.S. Congress may stay with you. I hope so; I know it well; I respect it greatly. As long as the Congress of the United States continues to function as a responsible and viable element in our constitutional system, the promise of American democracy will forever endure—the torch of freedom will forever light the path to our future.

Each of you, however, must also assume a personal responsibility for preserving freedom in these perilous times. This is not the business of someone else, it is your business. Freedom is the personal commitment and responsibility of each and every one. And the nature of this responsibility, I think, is best illustrated by John Adams' notion of the spirit of public happiness.

It was this spirit, said John Adams, that possessed the American colonists and won the Revolution even before it was fought—a spirit which is reflected in delight in participation in public discussion and public action. It is a sense of joy in citizenship, in self-government, in self-control, in self-discipline, and in wholehearted dedication.

An important part of the mission of this great university has been to instill in each of you this spirit of public happiness. And it will be this dedication to the public service—found in the hearts of Americans alive today and the generations yet unborn—that will insure the ultimate victory of freedom in their struggle against the forces of tyranny and oppression.

Your work is ahead of you. The time awaits no man. Seize this opportunity to serve the cause of mankind.

#### DILEMMA: STOP ADVERSE U.S. PAYMENTS BALANCE WITHOUT WORLDWIDE DEFLATION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, because international monetary arrangements are complicated and confusing, because their impact seems remote from our daily lives, and the consequences of international monetary policy seem subtle and indirect, many Americans, including those in high office, choose to ignore the tough details of the problem.

This is particularly true because the consequences of international monetary policy are not agreed on by the experts. These consequences are subject to sharp dispute. When economic experts argue in their technical language, the dispute seems dull, meaningless—or both.

In spite of this, it is most important that Members of Congress make the effort to focus on this tough problem of how we are going to handle our money arrangements with other countries.

What is at stake is literally the prosperity of this country, and the prosperity of the free world. Unwise expansionary money policies could lead directly to international inflation. They could undermine confidence in our dollar. They could paralyze our trade and commerce.

On the other hand, unwise do-nothing policies could provoke international deflation and a worldwide depression.

It is well known that this country has been losing gold at a rapid rate for more than a decade. Even more significant is the exodus of dollars into foreign hands and the buildup those dollars represent as a potential future drain on our remaining gold supply.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, at the same time, there is an ironic complementary consequence of this drain of U.S. dollars and gold. This U.S. loss has been precisely the fuel that has enabled the world to expand its trade at a record rate in the past 15 years, an expansion which has broken all records. World trade has more than doubled. The soaring strength of free world countries has, of course, been fostered by precisely this rise in trade and the ready cash fuel which has permitted it: U.S. dollars by the billions flowing in export from this country.

In a sense, it can be said that America has paid the price of spending its gold and its immense credit to build a stronger, more prosperous, more abundant free world.

But now, nearly half our great World War II gold supply is gone. The huge outpouring of dollars now held by foreigners far, far exceeds the remaining U.S. gold supply, and, of course, those foreign-held dollars can be presented to the U.S. Treasury for that remaining gold.

It is obvious to the President of the United States, and all of his top advisers, that the dollar and gold outflow must stop. Of course, this has been evident to our top leaders for some time.

Back in 1963, the Kennedy administration discussed the possibility of stemming the outflow of dollars with an interest equalization tax that would tax the income from foreign investments and discourage American dollars from seeking this investment.

This proposal worked brilliantly until it was enacted. As long as it was threatening, American investors over-discounted its effect and sharply diminished their export of U.S. dollars to buy foreign investments. But within a few months after it was enacted, American dollars poured out in a Niagara of investment abroad.

Then last February, the President inaugurated his voluntary loan restriction program with the cooperation of American banks and industry. The results have been, at first, sensationally successful.

The President and the Treasury Department together with the Federal Reserve have handled this brilliantly. And in the second quarter of this year the adverse balance of payments actually disappeared and became a substantial surplus.

But once again—as with the interest equalization tax—the favorable results are likely to be temporary. American funds abroad were repatriated. Investments abroad were temporarily postponed and, of course, in the long run, any big moratorium in American investment abroad simply means that American exports which grow and thrive on these investments, and American dividends and interest from foreign loans

that flow into this country from investments, will diminish.

What all this means is that we have not solved our adverse balance of payments—not by any means. And we must solve it.

Mr. President, I have such confidence in the determination of President Johnson and his advisers, and in the financial and economic muscle of this country once it is organized and unified in pursuit of an objective, that I know we can and will solve this tough problem without gutting our international security programs; that is, our military defense of the free world, and our economic—foreign aid—defense of the free world.

But the fact is that we have not solved it to date.

At the same time, Mr. President, we should be—we must be—well aware of the fact that when and as we do solve this adverse balance of payments—and we must—we are going to take from the channels of trade growth, the American deficit dollars and gold which have been a prime ingredient of its growth. This is exactly why it is necessary as well as wise for Secretary Fowler to work now as he has been doing on developing a reformed international monetary program to provide the liquidity that the correction of U.S. payments deficits will take away.

This, Mr. President, is why the kind of rational and thoughtful proposal for monetary reform suggested by Robert Roosa recently should have our careful and thoughtful study.

Mr. Roosa was perhaps the most brilliant international monetary expert our Treasury has had in a long, long time. When he resigned as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, the American banking community, as well as the American economic experts, recognized him as a man of consummate ability who had helped us greatly in the tough monetary years of the Kennedy administration with a series of imaginative and workable and practicable proposals.

Now he has come up with a thoughtful, carefully planned proposal for a sound and responsible solution to our international problem of creating the international ready cash we are going to need as American dollars and gold stop flowing abroad.

This morning's Wall Street Journal carries a superlative question-and-answer analysis of this Roosa proposal. This proposal, in my judgment, is likely to become the foundation, the basis for the American proposal to other leading trading countries for a solution to this tough problem that confronts us.

The proposal deserves our attention, our criticism, our evaluation.

I ask unanimous consent that the Wall Street Journal analysis of the Roosa plan be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 17, 1965]

#### ROOSA MONETARY PLAN: AN ANALYSIS

WASHINGTON.—The annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund here later this

month will dwell on ideas for insuring that world trade and general prosperity don't bog down for want of enough of the reserves that nations keep on hand to tide themselves over temporary balance-of-payments deficits, which result when more money goes out of a country than comes in.

It will probably be years before the member nations finally agree on whether to adopt any such plan, but if they do the impact on business around the world could be profound.

Of the many such ideas, the "Roosa plan" has sprinted to the fore in recent days. Here—based in large part on the author's explanations—are answers to questions about it:

What is the Roosa plan intended to do?

To create through the existing 102-member International Monetary Fund an entirely new unit of exchange, which governments will use in addition to gold, dollars, and pounds for settling payments deficits among themselves. The underlying assumption is that supplies of gold and currencies that nations currently consider sound enough to hold as reserves won't grow enough to meet needs arising from future growth in world trade.

Is the plan an official Johnson administration policy?

No, but it has many elements the administration likes and which planners think may prove acceptable compromises with the views of other countries. Robert V. Roosa is on President Johnson's Monetary Reform Advisory Committee, and his service as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs from 1961 through 1964 ranks him an expert on both the theories and practical politics of international finance. He is a partner in the New York banking firm of Brown Bros., Harriman & Co.

There are a lot of monetary ideas around; what makes the Roosa plan better than some others?

Supporters say that it preserves intact the proven international institutions and practices, such as the IMF and the wide use of gold and the dollar; that it would build onto this foundation a new responsiveness to changing needs, and that it would allow the more responsible, highly developed countries to deliberately plan additions to world reserves instead of leaving them to chance or to the whims of poorer countries.

What are the arguments against it?

Critics question whether the world's monetary authorities have the skill and the consensus needed to wisely make fairly frequent decisions about expansion of reserves.

Moreover, many Europeans dispute the fundamental prediction about reserves being in short supply unless some remedy is adopted. They say arbitrary creation of new reserves would be like printing new money without any increase in wealth as backing for it and thus would generate global inflation.

Finally, it's wondered whether, given new ability to live with balance-of-payments deficits, nations will put off the internal changes needed to attain balance or surplus. The Roosa plan is designed to tide nations over "temporary" balance-of-payments deficits, but who is to say what is temporary and what is likely to be chronic? The longer a nation delays unpleasant but essential domestic reforms and belt tightening, the worse the resulting crisis may be when it finally comes.

How would the Roosa plan alter the IMF?

At present, the IMF merely lends foreign currencies to members; they must repay the loans in 3 to 5 years. The Roosa plan would have the IMF, in addition to its lending activity, create new reserves—to be known as fund units—which the recipient countries would own outright.

Just how would these fund units be created?

A small group of key industrialized nations would form a committee within the IMF.

Most likely, they would include the Group of 10 that has been doing most of the studying of monetary reform: The United States, Great Britain, Belgium, Canada, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, and Sweden. They would take the initiative in recommending to the full 102-member IMF how many fund units should be created and when, and they alone would be eligible for the units at the outset.

Would these new reserves be created out of thin air?

Proponents of the plan say no. They explain that the recipient countries would have to pay offsetting amounts of their own currencies from their treasuries to the IMF. They insist this would mean giving up real resources, because the money could otherwise be spent in their own countries. The money they chip in would be pooled as backing for the fund units; in effect, as Mr. Roosa puts it, every unit would represent a bouquet of all these currencies.

Why can't these countries simply keep their money as reserves?

Because reserves are what a country uses to buy up its own currency from foreigners when that money threatens to become a glut on the world market. To reduce the supply of a currency in foreign hands, gold or some other currency must be used.

Also, some countries use reserves of foreign currencies for actual trade. A U.S. exporter, for instance, probably wouldn't want to be paid in Indian rupees, so India must keep widely useful foreign currencies, not its own money, in its reserves.

Does this mean the Fund unit countries would get something for nothing?

Only in the sense that the money they pay for Fund units can be used for their own official reserves and the Fund units can, say Roosa-plan backers. In fact, for this privilege each country would pay IMF 3 percent annually on its contribution.

Could inflation reduce the worth of the pooled currencies backing the Fund units?

Proponents say no, because the plan would require each country to guarantee its currency's value to the IMF in gold. If inflation cheapened its currency, a country would have to make up for this with extra contributions. It's also hoped that other countries would, like the U.S. pledge to pay out gold to other governments in return for their currencies at the fixed price of \$35 an ounce.

Could others force the United States to contribute more dollars and accept more reserve units than it really wants?

No. While one nation couldn't stop the committee and the full IMF from creating a certain amount, any nation would have the right to refuse to contribute and receive its share; the other participants would make up the difference.

Could many poorer countries dominate the process and cause an inflation of reserves?

Not if the voting follows the IMF's usual rules, which weigh votes by a nation's contributions, which in turn are geared to its wealth. The United States alone casts about 25 percent of the votes and the whole group of 10 can muster about 60 percent. Under the usual two-thirds majority rule, it could block any action it opposed.

How would the new units be doled out?

According to the extent each participant's currency has been used as reserves in the past, under detailed criteria yet to be worked out. This would be a "self-qualifying test," Mr. Roosa asserts, allowing other nations to enter the inner circle as they show enough economic responsibility to make their currencies prized by others. If it went into effect now, the United States would get about half the initial units issued, he estimates.

What form would each country's contribution take?

This isn't spelled out, but contributions to the IMF are typically in the form of special Treasury notes, a sort of check the IMF could cash for actual currency any time it wishes.

The IMF, based in Washington, stashes the notes in the central bank vaults of a number of its members.

Could a government use the Fund units it gets in return as freely as it uses its own money?

Not quite. It could use them to buy another country's currency from the issuing government, or its own currency from other governments. It could donate them as foreign aid, enabling a poorer country to take them to another government to buy that nation's currency, with which it in turn could buy real goods. It could lend them to a country needing more reserves. So that they could be freely interchangeable with gold and dollars in reserve dealings, they would have to have a set value in these terms. But Fund units couldn't be used in private transactions. Their use would be so rigidly limited to intergovernmental transactions that a government couldn't even use them to buy foreign currencies on exchange markets.

Doesn't it sound as if the IMF would be a sort of credit-creating Federal Reserve bank for the world?

Roosa-plan proponents insist it wouldn't, although there would be parallels. The Federal Reserve System in the United States can allow, but not require, commercial banks to make more loans by adding to their legally required reserves. The commercial banks can then make more loans by creating new checking account deposits for their customers. Gradually, the whole banking system can create about \$7 of the checking account money for each \$1 addition to its reserves.

But commercial banks wouldn't have any part in the Roosa system, so new money usable by businesses or individuals wouldn't be created by it—at least not directly. It would let the IMF create new reserves that the Federal Reserve or other central banks or governments would hold, though. If these extra reserves made a country feel more confident about allowing a high level of imports, that could contribute to the economic growth of that country and of its trading partners, Roosa-plan proponents contend. But any country's citizens would still need real domestic money to buy goods that have been imported.

Could a country's central bank use the Fund units to support more expansion of money and credit domestically, perhaps to the point of inflation?

Conceivably, it could, proponents concede, but they doubt that it would happen.

For one thing, any outside currencies add to a country's domestic money supply only if its commercial banks sell them to their central bank and get additions to their reserve accounts in exchange, allowing the commercial banking system to expand loans to their customers. Domestic money expansion couldn't happen in this way with fund units because they'd never be owned by any private bankers or other persons.

Any country could change its laws, of course, to include fund units in the base that limits its domestic money supply, as the United States at present uses gold as a base. But the trend is away from such arbitrary limits on money expansion. With or without new units, the Roosa school holds, the basic defense against inflation must be the firmness of each country's central bankers.

What, then, is the source of the uneasiness of the plan's critics?

They fear future political pressures will cause the governments themselves to rationalize use of the plan as an instrument of inflation. If the U.S. Treasury or Federal Reserve Board—or their counterparts in other countries—just issued additional currency or Treasury notes to exchange for the IMF's new fund units, they would be inflating the money supply. If, on the other hand, they withdrew their IMF contributions from the stream of existing domestic purchasing power



liberal economists and politicians almost certainly would build up pressure to run budget deficits or manipulate the traditional domestic monetary mechanisms to pump an equivalent amount back into the domestic economy to avoid deflation. These politicians and economists could argue this wasn't inflationary but merely an attempt to keep the domestic money and credit supply at the level that existed before the siphoning off of funds to the IMF mechanism. But, as a practical matter, paper currency or credit would have been created that hadn't existed before, without any corresponding increase in real wealth backing it up.

The orthodox cure for balance-of-payments deficits is to cut domestic consumption, reducing imports, and to lower domestic prices, spurring exports. This can be done by making credit scarcer and more expensive, or by other steps that some call deflationary and that others prefer to call anti-inflationary. To the extent the Roosa plan deflated the domestic money and credit supply to buy the new fund units, and thus finance payments deficits, it would accomplish the same end by a different means. And, say the Roosa-plan critics, if there were any evidence that most modern governments were willing to impose such discipline in their economies, they could have deflated in orthodox fashion without any need for new monetary reform plans. The only way the Roosa plan could function without introducing an element of deflation into domestic economies, say its critics, would be by inflating the world money supply. "You can't get something for nothing," the critics argue. "The only way you can create that illusion is by inflation."

Furthermore, critics fear that the United States, Britain, and other countries, arguing their payments deficits were temporary, could consider it comparatively painless to put up billions of dollars and pounds in exchange for the new currency units and continue living beyond their means for many years, particularly if they chose the "mild inflation" route. At present, the loss of gold and the other wherewithals to trade imposes a certain discipline, forcing nations running a deficit to trim their spending to match their earnings. Critics of the Roosa plan fear that participating governments might find it much less disagreeable to shovel out large sums of their domestic currencies, persuade the other industrial nations to authorize a corresponding increase in the new fund units and thereby postpone essential basic corrective steps.

How do Roosa-plan backers answer these criticisms?

They concede there could be pressures to turn the IMF into an engine of inflation but argue that there are always likely to be enough countries in the inner group actively worried about inflation in their own lands to prevent others from running away with the process of creating new fund units. These countries wouldn't have control over each other's domestic fiscal and monetary policies, however.

Roosa-plan proponents also say that if a country such as Britain, for instance, did think at the start that pouring out pounds for fund units is painless, it would before long discover that this isn't so. This is because under the plan a country would be obliged to pay out its currency to other countries for units, up to the amount of its currency it has contributed to the fund. So eventually the fund units others receive can become claims on real resources—on goods and services—from Britain. Because Britain would have to pay out pounds in return for fund units from any other country, that country would get British money with which its people could buy British goods. To avoid an outflow of goods big enough to cause prices to be bid up in its own country, each government would want to limit its contributions to the IMF pool. Also, contribu-

tions would be limited under the rules by the extent to which the country's currency has been used recently in reserves of others.

Would the United States stop losing gold if the new units were regarded "as good as gold"?

Basically, that would depend on whether the United States stops running the big deficit in its balance of payments that it had most of the time in recent years. Even assuming the United States does largely eliminate the deficit, Mr. Roosa figures we might not stop losing gold right away because foreigners still own quantities of dollars; but after the new unit gradually earns full confidence, we might even get some gold back. The aim, of course, is to have a new unit regarded with as much confidence as gold. This would be helped by the requirement that the new units be exchangeable for gold.

If nations will think so highly of the new unit, might they not defeat its purpose by hoarding it as jealously as they do gold?

For this, Mr. Roosa says he has "no pat answer." He says he can only hope that neither would be hoarded, that both would be freely used. But, supporters add, the only reason countries have for wanting to take part in the plan at all is to gain usable reserves.

What would happen to the dollar?

Other countries presumably would continue to hold massive amounts of it in their reserves, but—according to the Roosa theory, at least—most of the fresh supplies that would trickle out through small deliberate future deficits in the U.S. balance of payments would be kept in private foreign hands for actual use in trade. Increasingly, as fund units filled much of the old demand of governments for dollars to add to their reserves, the dollar would be freed for even wider use in world trade and finance.

How would the fund units differ from other schemes—for instance, the French idea of pooling a group of currencies into a "composite reserve unit," or CRU?

Those usually call for settling payments deficits in a fixed ratio of gold and CRU's, such as two-thirds gold and one-third CRU's. Mr. Roosa's units wouldn't have to be passed about in a fixed ratio with gold but are intended to be freely interchangeable with gold. He worries that the fixed ratio amounts to a disguised increase in the fixed \$35-an-ounce price of gold and thus a devaluation of the dollar. Administration men agree that any change in the gold price risks touching off a speculative run on gold by those who would then expect further increases in gold's value and further reductions in the dollar's worth.

How would the Roosa plan differ from the Bernstein plan?

Washington economist Edward M. Bernstein, also an administration consultant, would have leading nations agree on more or less automatic creation of a fixed amount of CRU's each year over a 5-year period; this, he believes, would avert recurring arguments over how much to create. Mr. Roosa expresses more confidence in the ability of international authorities to meet needs for extra reserves flexibly as situations change. "No simple rules," he says, "can be a substitute for judgment."

#### NEW WORLD CURRENCY COULD LEAD TO CONSERVATIVE WORLD ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, John Chamberlain is one of Washington's outstanding columnists. He is perceptive, writes with insight, and I always find his comments informative and useful.

However, as we all know, every rule has its exception. And I think we find an

exception in the case of Mr. Chamberlain in his column "What Value the CRU?" printed in the Washington Post on September 16.

Mr. Chamberlain states that the creation of a collective reserve unit, or CRU, would "turn the economic fate of the world over to a superbank designed to clip the power of all national central banks." This is, I think, a basic misconception. The CRU proposal, in fact, has been advanced as an alternative to the creation of a superbank, not as a device for achieving that objective. There is nothing inherent in creating a new currency reserve unit that detracts from national sovereignty or the power of individual central banks. Of course, the creation of such CRU's implies that participating countries will accept them for the settlement of international balances. But that is entirely different from turning the economic fate of the world over to a superbank. I think it is noteworthy that Mr. Robert V. Roosa, formerly the Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs, has as I have just said recently advanced his own variant of the CRU proposal. Mr. Roosa is known as an opponent of the idea of a world superbank.

Mr. Chamberlain finds it hard to see "how the creation of a CRU can save the nations from the consequences of domestic policies of an inflationary nature." But, with this statement, he reveals a lack of understanding of the proper role of international reserves. No form of international reserves can save nations from the consequences of economic folly. The purpose of international reserves is to permit nations to finance temporary deficits in their international accounts without having to adopt restrictive policies that disrupt domestic and international prosperity. All nations have imbalances in their international payments from time to time. Therefore, all need international reserves. As world trade grows, so do the imbalances that must be financed. It follows that the larger world trade, the larger the legitimate need for reserves.

Thus, the purpose of creating CRU is not to save nations from the consequences of folly. It is to provide nations with sufficient reserves that they may act with reasonable, not undue, speed to eliminate imbalances. The failure of the CRU proposal to save nations from the consequences of folly—something none of its sponsors have intended it to do—is hardly a legitimate criticism.

Mr. Chamberlain argues that if other countries continued to find the dollar as acceptable in the future as it was in the past, there would be no need for CRU's. This is true, but not much of a contribution to the solution of the world's liquidity problem. The fact is that other countries do not want to acquire very large additional dollar balances. And I do not believe that the threats suggested by Mr. Chamberlain such as pulling out of Saigon, would make the dollar much more attractive in their eyes. Recent gold losses have intensified our determination to bring to an end our balance of payments deficit on the official settlements definition. In this effort, we have made substantial progress.

Because of this progress, because dollars will no longer fill the gap between world liquidity needs and new supplies of gold, we must find an alternative. I do not say that the CRU proposal is the only or the best way to do it. There are a number of alternatives and I would like to see all of them explored thoroughly. In that connection, I call attention to the hearings and the report on "Guidelines for Improving the International Monetary System" of the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. This subcommittee, chaired by my colleague from Wisconsin, Representative REUSS, has done an excellent job in developing the prerequisites of an improved world monetary system. It is in the direction charted by the Reuss subcommittee that our best hope for the future of the international monetary system lies.

I ask unanimous consent that the Chamberlain column, "What Value the CRU?" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHAT VALUE THE CRU?

(By John Chamberlain)

STRESA, ITALY.—American tourists seem to be spending as they please all over Europe, quite as if President Lyndon Johnson had never said anything last winter about seeing America first. But this is quite in line with Washington's real policy, which is to let enough dollars go abroad to enable individuals, as distinct from nations, to live and prosper.

The "let the dollars move" atmosphere is evidently due to the persuasiveness at the White House of Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY of Minnesota, who is unimpressed with the theory that international payments must always be close to balance.

The feeling that "dollars must move" has formed the underlying motif of a distinguished panel of international monetary theorists here at the Mont Pelerin conference of economists. But it has been the only unifying thread that a layman could gather from the separate voices.

Between Prof. Milton Friedman, of Chicago, and Prof. M. Hellperin, of Geneva, there was little common ground aside from the idea that the present international money system is highly unsatisfactory.

Prof. Friedman, who believes in "free floating international exchange rates," considers the various nations' central bankers unnecessary; it is their "professional deformation" that makes them insist on trying to "play a part" in influencing events.

Friedman would let the citizens of all countries buy and sell as they please, using any acceptable currency supported by access to gold at free market prices. Prof. Hellperin, on the other hand, would return to an old-fashioned gold standard at a new fixed price in gold for the dollar and other currencies.

Since the nations insist on central banking institutions, and since there is little immediate likelihood of a return to the old-fashioned gold standard, neither Prof. Friedman nor Prof. Hellperin is likely to be called into instant consultation by statesmen. The actual intergovernmental deliberation between "experts" at the moment involve talk about a proposed international monetary unit called the CRU, or "collective reserve unit," which would be a combination of dollars, pounds, francs, and whatnot.

In effect, the sanctioning by separate nations of the CRU would turn the economic fate of the world over to a superbank designed to clip the power of all national central banks. The question then would be whether sovereign nations would be willing to put up with a money boss, a William McChesney Martin, endowed with global powers.

The layman, listening to the experts, finds it hard to see how the creation of a CRU can save the nations from the international consequences of domestic policies of an inflationary nature. Any antipoverty program that is paid for in an unbalanced national budget would be bound to create a distrust of at least a portion of the international "collective reserve unit."

In other words, we are always brought back to where we start. A CRU, to be acceptable as an international reserve unit, would be only as good as its component parts. But, assuming the acceptability of its components, it would not be needed.

It all comes back to commonsense at home in the end—and commonsense is what pressure groups resist when they are fighting for control of national policies. The CRU would be no better than the thinking of the British trade unions and the American AFL-CIO, or the desire in Texas or Nottinghamshire for easy credit. The fact at the moment is that the two main "key currencies" of the world, the dollar and the pound, are both distrusted. The question of why this is so goes back to domestic policies in the two great Anglo-Saxon countries.

But the problem is complicated by the fact that the outer world must trust the dollar, "or else." A Dutch economist, A. de Graaf, argued eloquently here at Stresa that if the dollar is good enough to pay for NATO and the anti-Communist war in Vietnam, it is good enough to deserve the trust of everybody.

The basic soundness of the dollar is proved by the fact that Americans could easily balance their international payments simply by withdrawing their soldiers from Europe, taking their fleet out of the Mediterranean, going home from Saigon, and cutting out foreign aid. The free world would hardly like that.

This plain fact puts a powerful engine of persuasion in Lyndon Johnson's hands. If he can use it with his ordinary Texas skill, the CRU will hardly be needed.

#### ADMIRAL RICKOVER ON NAMING POLARIS SUBMARINE FOR BEN FRANKLIN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all of us know of the remarkable contributions Admiral Rickover has made to his country's military and educational strength.

Recently he wrote me of the naming of the 30th Polaris nuclear submarine, the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin*.

In the course of his letter, Admiral Rickover, the sophisticated and brilliant scientist-statesman of 1965, pays a remarkable tribute to Benjamin Franklin, the scientist-statesman of the earliest days of this Republic.

Admiral Rickover calls attention to the remarkable scientific accomplishments of the amazingly versatile Poor Richard. He writes:

In the 6 years between 1746 and 1752 his (Franklin's) contributions to electricity changed it from a curiosity to a science, and in the process made him world famous. His writings were compared with Newton's optics; he became the friend of most contemporary scientists, was made a member of

virtually every scientific society and received honorary degrees from 20 universities. He was the first American scientist to win universal acclaim; the first American author to have his books translated and read as widely in Europe as in America.

Admiral Rickover concludes his tribute to Franklin this way:

His philosophy of life, the virtues he cultivated—competent workmanship, honesty, industry, and frugality—are within everyone's grasp; they are as important to a good and successful life today as in his time. No American child ought to grow to adulthood without having read the autobiography of this talented, wise, and good man, who personified all that is best in America. "Merely by being himself," wrote Mark Van Doren, "he dignified and glorified his country."

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Admiral Rickover be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AT SEA, NORTH ATLANTIC,  
August 30, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: We have just successfully completed the first sea trials of the U.S.S. *Benjamin Franklin*, our 30th Polaris nuclear submarine. We also have in operation 22 attack-type nuclear submarines, making a total of 52. The *Benjamin Franklin* was built by the Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp., Groton, Conn.

This ship is named for Benjamin Franklin (1706-90), one of the most illustrious of our Founding Fathers. A plain man of the people, his life was the American success story writ large. In his autobiography he speaks of his "lowly beginnings" and notes with quiet pride that he "emerged from the poverty and obscurity" of his birth to "a state of affluence and some degree of reputation in the world." He did so purely on merit, for he was, in every sense of the word, a self-made man, owing little if anything to luck or the assistance of others, never pushing ahead at the expense of a fellowman.

Franklin was the youngest son of a poor tallow chandler who had migrated to Boston from England and married as his second wife the daughter of a former indentured serving maid. With 17 children to raise, he could give Benjamin only 2 to 3 years of schooling, but he encouraged him to study on his own, a habit which was to remain with Franklin all his life. At 10 the boy went to work in the family shop; at 12 he was apprenticed to his half-brother to learn the printing trade, this being considered a suitable vocation for one whose love of books was already manifest.

In later life Franklin often remarked that he could not remember a time when he did not read. Books were his teachers. Through them he made himself a well-educated man. Taking the best authors as his models, he worked hard at perfecting his writing, eventually achieving a simple, lucid style. His thirst for knowledge never ceased. Since he wanted to read foreign books, he decided at 27—a busy young merchant—to teach himself to do so. "I soon made myself so much the master of the French," he remarked, "as to be able to read the books with ease. I then undertook the Italian." Later on, "with a little painstaking, acquired as much of the Spanish as to read their books also." He read not only for instruction but for enjoyment. His taste was catholic. All his life, men of learning and position, who would ordinarily not bother with an artisan, sought Franklin's company. He supposed it was because "reading had so improved my mind that my conversation was valued."

At 17 Franklin had learned all his brother could teach him and was ready to make his



own way in the world. He went to New York but could find no work there, so continued on to Philadelphia. This is how he describes his arrival there after a long and uncomfortable trip—walking 50 miles, getting nearly shipwrecked, and helping to row a boat part of the way: "I was dirty from my journey; my pockets were stuffed out with shirts and stockings; I knew no soul, nor where to look for lodging. I was fatigued with traveling, rowing, and want of rest. I was very hungry and my whole stock of cash consisted of a Dutch dollar." He bought three large bread rolls. Wandering about town, munching, he met a fellow traveler. He gave her and her child two of his rolls. Thus did Franklin enter the town that was to become his permanent home, where he would rise to wealth and fame.

Seven years later he owned his own print shop, a stationery store, and a newspaper. He had in the meantime perfected his art by working for 18 months in England and could do the most intricate and difficult print jobs. At 26 he began the highly profitable annual publication of *Poor Richard's Almanac*. He managed his affairs so ably that at 42 he retired with an income equivalent to that of a royal governor. Though he was good at it, moneymaking never interested him, except as a means to obtain leisure for the things he really enjoyed: reading, study, scientific experimentation, social discourse and correspondence with men of similar interests.

While still a journeyman printer, he had founded a club for sociability and self-improvement, called the *Junto*, of which he later said that it was "the best school of philosophy, morals, and politics" then existing in Pennsylvania. Its membership of about 12 consisted of alert, intelligent young artisans, tradesmen, and clerks who liked to read and debate. They met Friday evenings to discuss history, ethics, poetry, travels, mechanics arts and science (then called natural philosophy). It has been said of this group that it "brought the enlightenment in a leather apron to Philadelphia."

Franklin, who was full of ideas for improving life in Philadelphia and the colonies in general, submitted all his proposals to the *Junto* where they were debated. Once accepted, members worked hard to get them put into effect. As a result, improvements were made in paving, lighting, and policing the town; a volunteer fire department and militia were formed; a municipal hospital was established; the foundations were laid for what became the University of Pennsylvania and the American Philosophical Society. Of most lasting importance, perhaps, was Franklin's plan for a subscription library, the first in the colonies. Access to books, he felt, meant that "the doors to wisdom were never shut." The idea caught on. He noted with satisfaction that the numerous libraries springing up everywhere "have improved the general conversation of Americans, made the common tradesmen and farmers as intelligent as most gentlemen from other countries, and perhaps have contributed in some degree to the stand so generally made throughout the colonies in defense of their privileges." The value of knowledge to man and society has never been put more succinctly.

When he was 40, Franklin discovered electricity. It was then a sort of magic, a parlor trick. Franklin—ably supported by his *Junto*—threw himself into experimentations and developed a workable theory which he proved in his famous kite experiment. In the 6 years between 1746 and 1752 his contributions to electricity changed it from a curiosity to a science, and in the process made him world famous. His writings on electricity were compared with Newton's "Optics"; he became the friend of most contemporary scientists, was made a member of virtually every scientific society and received honorary degrees from 20 universities. He was the first American scientist to

win universal acclaim; the first American author to have his books translated and read as widely in Europe as in America. When he was sent to Paris, as America's first Ambassador to a major power, the admiration of France for Franklin's scientific achievement in catching lightning and putting it to man's use contributed not a little to the success of his mission: winning the help of France to the revolutionary cause.

As a man of leisure, Franklin found himself more and more drawn into public service, this being expected of anyone who had the time and ability to serve. He became a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature, the Committee of Five charged with drafting the Declaration of Independence, the Second Continental Congress and the Constitutional Convention. In one way or another, he represented America abroad a total of 25 years, becoming an exceedingly skillful diplomat. His statement, in hearings before Parliament, of the case of the colonies against the hated Stamp Act was masterly and helped bring about the repeal of this act. He was among the first to recognize that not merely "taxation" but "legislation in general" without representation could not be borne by Englishmen, whether they lived at home or abroad. The bond uniting England and its colonies, he argued, was the King, not Parliament. Had his "dominion status theory" been accepted, the war might have been prevented but, as he sadly remarked, "there was not enough wisdom."

At 65, Franklin began his autobiography, intending it for his son. When pressure of public duties interrupted work on the book, one of his friends pleaded with him to complete it. All that had happened to Franklin, he urged, was of great historic interest since it was "connected with the detail of the manners and situation of a rising people." Moreover, the way he had planned and conducted his life was "a sort of key and explained many things that all men ought to have once explained to them, to give them a chance of becoming wise by foresight."

His philosophy of life, the virtues he cultivated—competent workmanship, honesty, industry and frugality—are within everyone's grasp; they are as important to a good and successful life today as in his time. No American child ought to grow to adulthood without having read the autobiography of this talented, wise, and good man, who personified all that is best in America. "Merely by being himself," wrote Mark van Doren, "he dignified and glorified his country."

Respectfully,

H. G. RICKOVER.

#### RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Calendar No. 728, S. 1898.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1898) for the relief of certain aliens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, to strike out "Yung Soon Noh," and insert in lieu thereof "Kim Kwang Ja."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on this bill, S. 1898, for the relief of certain aliens, I offer an amendment showing the proper name of one of the individuals contained in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator permit action first on the committee amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, it is proposed to strike "Yung Soon Noh," and insert in lieu thereof "Kim Kwang Ja."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now state the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 10, it is proposed to strike out "Yung Soon Noh" and insert in lieu thereof "Kim Kwang Ja."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Soo Un Chun, Soo Hoy Chun, Soo Kyung Chun, Kim Kwang Ja, Yung Joo Song, Ok Jung Hang, and Jung Ok Im may be classified as eligible orphans within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act and petitions may be filed by Ray and Jane Potter, citizens of the United States in behalf of the said Soo Un Chun, Soo Hoy Chun, Soo Kyung Chun, Kim Kwang Ja, Yung Joo Song, Ok Jung Hang, and Jung Ok Im pursuant to section 205(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act subject to all the conditions in that section relating to eligible orphans. Section 205(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in these cases.*

#### THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PASSAGE OF THE WATER CARRIER ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, September 18, 1965, marks the 25th anniversary of part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, which extended regulation to the domestic water carrier industry. This act also for the first time spelled out our national transportation policy.

Prior to 1940, the Commission's water carrier jurisdiction involved principally those carriers engaged in through routes and joint rates with rail lines or controlled by railroads. The inland water transport industry, at that time, had been in decline since the heyday of the river packets before the turn of the century. Water carrier companies were small, poorly equipped to meet the transportation needs of shippers and industry, and underfinanced.

Inland water carriers have shown a steady advancement since the passage of the 1940 act. Ton-miles on inland

waterways, including Great Lakes, more than doubled from an estimated 96 billion in 1939 to 220 billion in 1960. The preliminary ton-mile figure for 1964, shows an increase of 248 billion ton-miles.

The water transportation industry has been among the leaders in transportation innovation during the last 25 years. In 1956, for example, towboat horsepower was in the range of 3,200. These tugs could move an average 1.25 million ton-miles a day. The big 6,000- and 9,000-horsepower tugs of today can produce about 4 million ton-miles upstream and down. Powerful towboats can push a tow of 40 barges carrying 40,000 tons of cargo. These modern towboats are equipped with radar for navigation, depth finders, automatic steering devices, swing indicators to keep long tows on course, and air-conditioned pilothouses and crew quarters. Even the barges have been changed. Today barges are of many different specialized kinds, of greater size, and have been designed to be assembled into an integrated tow.

The Transportation Act of 1940 also added a declaration of our national transportation policy. The policy of the Congress was established providing for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each, to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation network by water, highway and rail adequate to meet the needs of commerce and the national defense.

The present growth and health of our domestic waterways carriers, operating within the framework of part III of the Interstate Commerce Act, and the national transportation policy, affords dramatic evidence that fair and impartial regulation can assure prosperity and progress for an industry and promote the national interest of the shipping and consuming public.

I would like to take the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the passage of the Transportation Act of 1940, to salute the record of growth of the domestic water carrier industry, and also the national transportation policy which has enabled the development of our transportation industry under private enterprise in the national interest.

I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article from the June 1965 issue of *Dun's Review & Modern Industry*, entitled "High Tide on the Waterways," and our national transportation policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**HIGH TIDE ON THE WATERWAYS: THE SPUNKY, CHUNKY TOWBOATS ARE PUSHING MORE FREIGHT THAN EVER BEFORE**

The words were spoken by wiry, raspy President W. L. Mapother of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad: "Transportation by river?" he snorted. "How can anyone take seriously something that is dried up all summer and fall, frozen up all winter, and too high in spring for any real boats to get under the bridges?"

While Mapother made that statement in 1922, a low-water year for the barges, he

would have been astounded if, in 1965, he could have floated along the broad Mississippi, the narrow Missouri, the twisting Ohio, the Tombigbee, the Green and the Barren, the Kanawha, or any of the Nation's 23 principal waterways. On them he would see the spunky, chunky little towboats pushing a massive cluster of barges, perhaps one-third of a mile long and nearly six acres in area. If he could have added up the tonnage moving on the Nation's 25,260 miles of usable inland channels, he would have found that it came to more than 139 billion ton-miles—no less than 10 percent of all the Nation's freight.

He would have been astounded, moreover, at the diversity of goods on these barges. On the Alabama River he might see the vast coal movement that has left his own competing railroad, the L. & N., with only a narrow, steady earnings record. At Cairo, Ill., where the Ohio tumbles into the mighty Mississippi, he would see the barges carrying a true jet-age cargo: Saturn space vehicle boosters for rockets and space capsules, built at Huntsville, Ala., and moving to Cape Kennedy, Fla., by the only method of transportation that can handle them.

But it is on the banks of the rivers that Mapother would receive his biggest surprise. There, the customers quite literally are building plants to be near the barges. At one point last year, for example, U.S. industry had committed itself to build no less than \$400 million worth of new chemical plants along the stretch of Mississippi River between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. The beaches, bars and biskinis of Biloxi, Miss., were being joined by a brandnew canal, so far only 9 miles long but with four new industries already camped on its banks. And at Michoud, La., the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was building a ground-testing station for rocket stages and engines simply because of its nearby canal.

Even more amazing, much of the activity in this oldest of American industries is due to two of the Nation's most forward-looking industries. Ideally suited to moving massive commodity shipments, where time is not a compelling factor, the barges count on the oil and chemical companies as their two best customers. All told, 150 million tons of petroleum and petroleum products go sailing down the Nation's rivers every year. The chemical industry, only a step behind, ships 140 different chemical commodities by barge—ranging from anhydrous ammonia, moved under a pressure of 250 pounds per square inch, to liquid hydrogen, which must be transported at a temperature of minus 423° F.

With both industries booming, the barges have been moving in a swift current themselves this year. Even the heavy floods of early spring were not slowing them up. "Our first quarter," says President Floyd H. Blaske of American Commercial Lines, operator of the Nation's largest fleet, "has been excellent—up about 42 percent from last year."

It was much the same story at St. Louis Shipbuilding-Federal Barge. "How was the winter traffic?" asks Chairman Herman T. Pott. "It's been good. The floods haven't affected us. Some of the companies have had barges stuck up in Minneapolis, but not us."

"The flood will prevent us from having a tremendous year," says President Wesley J. Barta of the Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co. "As it is, our earnings will be higher than last year. Without the flood, we were looking for earnings of \$3. Now we're counting on something about \$2.75, up from \$2.64 last year."

#### WHY THE BOOM?

But what accounts for this boom on the bargeways? No matter how rushed, the barges can do no more than move along at a stately average of 6 miles an hour. Why,

then, was industry building plants along the waterways of American Commercial Barge, Union Barge and other lines?

First of all, there was that most prime of all economic inducements: cost. No other form of transportation is as cheap as the barge. According to the American Waterways Operators, the industry's trade association, the cost to a customer of barging comes to just 3 mills per ton-mile. In contrast, says the same group, rail service costs 15 mills per ton-mile, truck service 64 mills and airfreight a high-flying 20 cents per ton-mile.

In part, of course, that is because the barge rides down the river as freely as Huck Finn's raft. The Army's Corps of Engineers, for example, works constantly to keep the bargeways open, recently canalized the Chattahoochee River and even now is building 19 locks and dams on the Arkansas-Verdigris River system. Again, if a tow has 5, 10 or 15 barge loads waiting to be pushed down the river, it is a simple and highly economical maneuver to add another 1, 5, 10 or 25 (a tow or tug may push or pull anywhere up to 40 barges).

Sometimes even nature lends a hand. "I don't mean flood height," says Herman Pott. "But when the river is high, we can bring the bigger boats up the river. And navigation is easier too. We have more room to navigate when we reach those normally tight spots."

But there is a second reason why industry is moving to the river. For all their colorful history—as early as 1819, 500 keelboats moved on the Ohio River and its tributaries, pushed by men using iron-tipped poles that reached to river bottom—the barge operators have always been careful not to fall behind the times. Unlike the railroads, for example, they have not held back on buying new equipment or on keeping up with the march of technology.

Reason: The barge industry always has had to run scared. Bitter competition is rooted in its earliest history. The railroads of the era of Jay Gould, Jim Fisk, and Commodore Vanderbilt bought up river lines and lake lines, using them as fighting ships to bleed the competing lines to death, and bought still other lines, only to let their vessels, terminals and docks rot on the shore. Not until 1912, with the Panama Canal Act, were the railroads prevented from owning water carriers.

The depredations were so bad that even today most bargemen have never really been able to forget those days. Asked about the new piggybacking, the unit trains and the massive hoppers now appearing on the railroad tracks, Wesley Barta of Mississippi Valley Barge gives what is a typical bargeman's answer. "The railroads," he notes, "are able to participate in larger bulk movements than they did in the past. But we're innovating to compete. We're building larger barges and reducing labor costs through modernization and mechanization."

The effect has been, however, that the bargemen always could offer up-to-date equipment to shippers. In recent years, particularly, the canals and rivers have been swept by a high tide of technology. In towboats alone, for example, the range of horsepower has jumped from 3,200 horsepower as recently as 1956 to 6,000 and 9,000 horsepower today.

Weighting a downstream time against upstream, the less powerful tugs of 1956 could move an average 1.25 million ton-miles a day. Today? "The big boats today," says Capt. A. C. Ingersoll, Jr., president of Federal Barge Lines, "will produce about 4 million ton-miles upstream and down."

A prime example of the new tows is the 9,000-horsepower *United States*, built by St. Louis Shipbuilding-Federal Barge (the "Federal" goes back to the days when it built ironclad gunboats during the Civil War). The most powerful towboat in the world, the *United States* can push a tow of 40 barges



carrying 40,000 tons of cargo. In fact, it moves a cargo three to four times the size of that carried by the average ocean freighter.

The other lines also have been strengthening their tugs and tows. At American Commercial Lines, President Floyd H. Blaske and Chairman Jacob W. Hershey last year put into service the *Hugh C. Blaske* (named after Floyd Blaske's father, whose Blaske lines merged with American Barge in 1956), a 4,800-horsepower twin-screw towboat. While not as large as some of the Federal tugs, the Blaske has exceeded all of the company's expectations.

So much so, in fact, that Blaske and Hershey promptly started building a second tow of the same type, the *Clyde Butcher*. A third towboat of this type will follow some time late this year.

#### DRESSING UP BARGES

Along with adding muscle to their tows, the lines also have been dressing up their barges. And while it is true that the awkward, ungainly barge still resembles the craft that the railroadmen ran off the river, it really is not. There have been any number of innovations. For one, barges have been designed to be assembled into an integrated tow. With each one shaped slightly different, the whole group has an underwater shape that is roughly the equivalent of a single vessel; thus the water resistance of the integrated tow is nearly equivalent to the smooth underwater lines of a single vessel of equivalent total strength.

As a compromise on this type of barge (whose drawback is that it must be operated as a unit), the bargemen have produced a vessel with a well-designed rake on one end and a square on the other. Assembled square end to square end, two such barges have an 8 percent increase in capacity with 18 percent less resistance in the water.

Like the railroadmen, moreover, the barge operators have developed many different types of barges, following the transportation industry trend to specialized equipment. Open hopper barges, for example, move roughly one-fifth of all the coal pouring from U.S. mines. In addition, they move massive amounts of raw materials for steel and aluminum, as well as sand, gravel, crushed rocks, outsized tanks, pressure vessels, and hundreds of other items.

A variant is the covered dry-cargo barge. It carries a long list of items, including grain and grain products, coffee, soybeans, paper and paper byproducts, dry chemicals, aluminum and aluminum products.

Still another type—the tank barge—carries liquid commodities. Here, the cargo may range from acetic acid to molten sulfur that moves in barges especially designed to keep the brimstone as hot and ready for use as its Biblical counterpart. All told, more than 2,500 tank barges, with a total cargo capacity of almost 4.25 million tons, are moving along the river and waterways.

The barges also have been growing in size. "A few years ago," says Wesley Barta, "we thought 1,200 tons was the maximum bulk load for a hopper. Now, for our largest coal account—Commonwealth Edison Co. in Chicago—we use hoppers with 1,650-ton capacity."

With revenues and profits running at high tide, all the barge lines have been adding to their fleets. Thus Dravo Corp.'s Union Barge last year added 30 new units to its 300-barge fleet, and expects to make further additions this year. Similarly, American Commercial Barge added 82 new barges to its fleet, which already is the largest in the Nation.

St. Louis Shipbuilding-Federal Barge, for its part, has spent roughly \$17.5 million since 1953 to modernize its barge fleet. Last year the company added 27 barges to its fleet at a cost of about \$1.8 million. This year the company expects to spend \$4.5 million.

As further strengthening of their operations, it should be noted that most of the lines also have been diversifying. While there are exceptions, such as Mississippi Valley Barge's heavy purchases of stock in the Water Treatment Corp., most of the lines have stayed fairly close to the bargeways or to transportation.

American Commercial, for example, last year paid out \$18.2 million for the Bauer Dredging Co., which operates 12 dredges, 23 tugs, 45 barges and a Texas shipyard, along with owning large amounts of real estate. By so doing, of course, American Commercial not only enlarged its barging operations, it got a firm stake (\$13.2 million a year in gross revenues) in hydraulic dredging, oyster-shell dredging and marketing and the contracting of jetty and harbor construction.

#### LIKE THE RAILROADS?

But with the tide running so heavily in their favor, are the bargemen likely to forget the days of strife behind them? Are they, in short, likely to become overly complacent as the railroads did in their heyday?

It is hardly likely. First of all, the waterway is hardly an iron rail that can go unattended for fairly long periods. So far this year, for example, there have been the problems of ice on the Mississippi, which usually clears by late March but did not open up until late May, the massive flood that gripped so much of the Midwest, and a strike in New Orleans.

Then there is one of the biggest problems of all: the stretch of the Mississippi River between St. Louis and Cairo, Ill. Along this stretch, "Old Man River" rises and falls in what appears to be 10-year cycles. Currently, the river is in the shallow phase of the cycle. During some of the worse periods, barges cannot carry capacity weight between the two points—and much of the history of barges revolves around the key point of Cairo—and some of the industry's bigger boats cannot even attempt the journey. "I think," says Floyd Blaske, of American Commercial Lines, "that they will construct low-water dams at Grand Tower, Ill., and Commerce, Mo. At these points, rock ledges cross the river, and here is where most of the trouble is."

Until then, though, the bargemen must somehow ease their way along. The matter is still in the study stage by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Mississippi Valley Association, the mayor's committee of St. Louis, and a host of other groups.

What about competition? There is, for example, the railroads. After long years in the doldrums, the rails are coming back with a vengeance, particularly in that barge-line specialty, the moving of bulk commodities.

Though keeping a wary eye on their traditional enemy, the bargemen argue that they have not yet felt the impact of the railroad renaissance. Take the two- and three-level rack cars that now carry so many of the Nation's new autos. "They affect the trucks more than the barges," says Herman Pott. "In the old days, we used to put cars on top of oil barges, but that was ended by the Common Carrier Act. And after the war, two tows were built to carry 600 cars each. They ran for 10 or 15 years and made money, but they aren't used anymore. Now, piggy-back is used."

Indeed, it might even be said that the barges now have reached the point where they are willing to join hands with the railroads. For industry not located on the riverbanks, a combination of river and rail transportation could mean the lowest transportation rates yet. Most bargemen advocate the development of such a system.

So far, however, the railroads have built a "Chinese Wall" around themselves. They will not develop through rates, and many bargemen charge that, even if the rails can coordinate a shipment with the barge lines,

they stick to the rails. "I'm glad to see the railroads trying to improve their operations," says Floyd Blaske. "But one chief criticism of them is their reluctance to join the river transporters to develop through rates."

If they needed any further assurance that the tide was running their way, the bargemen could find it on one of the principal waterways of Europe. Of all the great rivers that pass through the Continent, the greatest surely must be the Rhine, and the Europeans always have pulled their barges along it. Last year, with an eye on the success of the Americans, the 2,000-year-old European industry started pushing its barges along the Rhine.

[September 18, 1940]

#### NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

It is hereby declared to be the national transportation policy of the Congress to provide for fair and impartial regulation of all modes of transportation subject to the provisions of this act, so administered as to recognize and preserve the inherent advantages of each; to promote safe, adequate, economical, and efficient service and foster sound economic conditions in transportation and among the several carriers; to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services, without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices; to cooperate with the several States and the duly authorized officials thereof; and to encourage fair wages and equitable working conditions;—all to the end of developing, coordinating, and preserving a national transportation system by water, highway, and rail, as well as other means, adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States, of the Postal Service, and of the national defense. All of the provisions of this act shall be administered and enforced with a view to carrying out the above declaration of policy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reference is made at great length to the improvement of the twisting Ohio River to facilitate the carriage of millions of tons of cargo.

#### ROCKY RIVER CO. AND MACY LAND CORP.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 1390, a private claim bill for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1390) for the relief of Rocky River Co. and Macy Land Corp., which was, on page 2, line 10, strike out "shells: Provided, That no" and insert "shells. The payment of the amount authorized by this Act shall be conditioned on a full and final release executed by the said Rocky River Company and the Macy Land Corporation forever releasing the United States as to any claims by the said Rocky River Company and the said Macy Land Corporation or their transferees or assigns, based upon the condition of the lands referred to in this Act or upon any ordinance material remaining in that land, or damage or injury therefrom, and the release shall further provide that the Rocky River Company and Macy Land Corporation further agree in return for the payment of the amount provided in this Act that they will assume all liability for injury or damage which may result

from any ordnance material remaining in said land and will indemnify and hold harmless the United States for any claims asserted by reason of injury or damage caused by such ordnance material. No".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill, as amended by the House of Representatives, is agreeable to the sponsor of this legislation and also the Committee on the Judiciary.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

#### MRS. HARLEY BREWER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to S. 1198, a private claim bill for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1198) for the relief of Mrs. Harley Brewer which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,500 to the estate of Harley Brewer, deceased, in full satisfaction of the claims of the decedent against the United States for compensation authorized to be paid to him by Private Law 88-360, approved October 14, 1964, but which was not so paid to the said Harley Brewer by reason of his death prior to enactment of the said private law: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act for the relief of the estate of Harley Brewer, deceased."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the bill, as amended by the House of Representatives, is agreeable to the sponsor of this legislation and also the Committee on the Judiciary.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

#### OH WHA JA (PENNY KORLEEN DOUGHTY)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 402.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 402) for the relief of Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty), which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 203(a) (2) and 205 of the Immigration and Na-

tionality Act, Oh Wha Ja (Penny Korleen Doughty) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Doughty, citizens of the United States: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on May 24, 1965, the Senate passed S. 402, to enable the 22-year-old beneficiary adopted by U.S. citizens to qualify for nonquota status as an eligible orphan.

On August 17, 1965, the House of Representatives passed S. 402, with an amendment to grant the beneficiary second preference status as the natural-born alien daughter of U.S. citizens.

I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

#### VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY BRINGS GREAT SOCIETY TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has become a great spokesman of the Great Society and the programs of this administration. In his speech at the Virginia Municipal League in Virginia Beach, Va., last Tuesday, September 14, 1965, Vice President HUMPHREY outlined the opportunities, challenges and potentials of our local communities to become the leading part in the Great Society.

Mr. President, as a tribute to one of the most inspirational speakers in politics today, and a man who personifies a dynamic government by his own personal characteristics, I ask unanimous consent that the fine speech delivered by Vice President HUMPHREY be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, VIRGINIA MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, VIRGINIA BEACH, VA., SEPTEMBER 14, 1965

I am pleased to be your guest at your 60th annual meeting today.

Several months ago the President asked me to act as his liaison with officials of local government. As a former mayor—one who knows local government first-hand—I welcomed that assignment. Because I know how distant and remote Washington can seem to the man with local responsibility. I have been trying, in these months, to make Washington less distant, less remote, more able to help.

Virginia has a national reputation for good municipal government. The city manager form of government was born in Virginia in 1908. Today your excellent training programs in municipal administration are being adopted in other parts of the country.

You have recognized the great opportunities, the great challenges, the great potentials today for creative local government.

This administration is pledged to the goal of a Great Society—a society of opportunity.

This administration and the Congress are launching creative new programs toward that opportunity.

But the future of our Nation lies not only with the Federal Government and the legis-

lative branch. It lies in our heartland—in individual American communities.

The Great Society will be an America made up of thousands of great communities. It will be an America built where you serve.

It is your communities that will have good schools or bad ones.

It is your communities that will have decent homes or slums.

It is your communities that will have racial harmony or racial antagonism.

It is your communities that will either wage intelligent, coordinated drives on the causes of poverty—or will ignore this social cancer.

My 20 years in political life—from mayor to Vice President—have taught me what I only vaguely understood when I was a political science teacher: That the key to success of great national programs is local implementation and imaginative leadership.

My experience in public life has also taught me that we cannot blame our problems on some other level of government. There are too many manufactured antagonisms between the local, State, and Federal levels—antagonisms too often manufactured to escape responsibility at home base.

No greater opportunity faces all of us today than the opportunity to strengthen the economic and social structures of our communities, of our Nation.

We are moving ahead in seizing that opportunity. We are investing in both the material and human resources of this Nation.

Our goal is nothing less than this: To give each American citizen, and each American community, the opportunity to contribute to and share in our American progress.

We can do nothing less. For we must build a stronger and better America—a country running on all its cylinders—to meet the change and challenge of the years ahead.

There is one change we all know about: The change of our country from a rural nation to an urban nation.

It was only 45 years ago that people in American cities first began to outnumber people on our farms.

But by 1970, we can expect that three-fourths of our people will be living in towns, cities, and suburbs, compared to 70 percent in 1960. At the end of 1964, two-thirds of our population lived in 219 such areas, an increase from 59 percent in 1950. By 1980 that proportion will increase to three-fourths and by the year 2000 to four-fifths.

This growth has imposed new and unprecedented burdens on local government for schools, housing, streets, and highways, commercial expansion, transit, and welfare programs.

Today there are over 9 million American homes which should not be lived in, but are. Four million of those homes have no running water or plumbing.

There is congestion in our cities which cause a man to take more time to get to and from work than it does for an astronaut to orbit the earth.

There are water shortages.

There are millions of children who will, without a doubt, be on the welfare rolls a few years hence if something isn't done. One out of every three children now in fifth grade will not finish high school, if the present dropout rate continues.

There is a general shortage of clean, fresh air—of open space—of park land—of the things that make life livable.

No single community in this age of change can meet these demands alone and without help. That is why there are more than 15 major programs of Federal assistance to local governments. In fiscal 1965 there will be a total of \$11.4 billion in Federal aid payments to State and local units. Of that amount, the Federal Government is paying \$1.4 billion to our 91,186 local units.

To those who fear that the Federal Government is usurping the power and province



of State and local governments—that the Federal Government is growing too large, I point to a few salient facts:

State and local share of all Government revenues has increased more than 50 percent in the last 20 years. At the same time, State and local spending have increased more than 200 percent.

This year, State and local purchases of goods and services will exceed those of the Federal Government for the first time since 1950.

The Federal debt has increased approximately 20 percent in the last 20 years; State and local debt has increased 420 percent.

In the last 20 years, the number of Federal civilian employees has increased by 100,000—that is, about 4 percent. State and local government employees have increased by 3.7 million—an increase of over 200 percent.

No, the Federal Government is not swallowing State and local government. In fact, there is a case to be made that the Federal Government has not done enough.

All governments—Federal, State, and local—must act as partners in solving the complex problems facing the city.

No, good fences do not make good neighbors when those fences are built between people who must work together to get a job done.

This administration is taking active steps to help cities. In this legislative session alone, the American Congress has passed historic laws to provide that help, to provide lower-cost housing, to create more jobs, to strengthen the local tax base, to provide better sharing of costs, to reduce crime, to improve health conditions, to stop discrimination, and to give the American city a voice at the highest levels of Government through a new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

We will not turn our backs on the problems of our neighbors.

We will not try to pay for needed services at one level of government alone—be it Federal, State, or local government.

We will work together to meet the needs of our citizens and provide opportunity for all.

Our American economy is prosperous and expanding. We look forward to a trillion-dollar economy in 10 years' time.

We have the means, we have the energy, we have the will—we have the leadership to meet change and make it our ally, not our enemy. We can achieve a Great Society.

I said earlier that the building of that Great Society will depend on the building of great communities.

And these communities, in turn, must be built by great people—people of tolerance, compassion and understanding; people of education and good health; people seeking and using opportunity; people of hope and confidence; people who have faith in themselves, their country and the future.

President Johnson has made his commitment to this task. I join him in that commitment. We ask your help.

#### COMMENDATION FOR AIR RESCUE SERVICE DETACHMENT 4 AT PAINE FIELD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, Donald F. Jennings, sheriff of Snohomish County, Wash., has provided me with a copy of a letter he wrote to Secretary of the Air Force Zuckert on August 16 concerning the excellent cooperation the people of Snohomish County have received from Air Force personnel stationed at Paine Field there. He particularly praises the work of a helicopter unit at Paine Field, citing many instances where the men of this unit have risked their

own lives in saving others. Sheriff Jennings also provided copies of this letter to Senator MAGNUSON and Representative MEEDS, and they join me in stating our appreciation to the men of Air Rescue Service Detachment 4 at Paine Field. I ask unanimous consent to insert Sheriff Jennings' letter in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SNOHOMISH COUNTY, WASH.,  
August 16, 1965.

EUGENE ZUCKERT,  
Secretary of the Air Force,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the latter part of 1962, Snohomish County received the first of a continuing installment gift. This gift has been impossible to assay as it consists of total devotion to duty and beyond duty, and a total devotion to the community in which they found themselves, of a group of uniformed men of the U.S. Air Force. The number of times various members of the group risked their lives in attempting to alleviate suffering and preserve the lives of others during the time between 1962 and this writing has never been fully recorded, but the records and files of this office and available news sources furnish sufficient information from which to understand something of the deep gratitude we feel toward Air Rescue Service Detachment 4, Western Air Rescue Center, Paine Air Force Base, Paine Field, Wash.

Capt. Robert McDougal, Capt. Karl G. King, Capt. Ronald L. Bachman, 1st Lt. William Austin III, M. Sgt. Thomas A. Sternad, T. Sgt. James Johnson, A/1 James M. Brennan, A/2 Eugene H. Doucett, A/3 James W. Smith, and A/3 Phillip W. Mittelstaedt, were the men we have come to know so well and so favorably. Unfortunately during this period some other friendly and helpful crew members who worked with us went to new assignments before we had any record of them.

Besides the deep gratitude we feel for the service to the community by these men, we of this Department have benefited enormously from their assistance. On many, many assignments, their efforts have made our duties easier, and in a number of cases were certainly the difference between failure and success when the penalty for failure was death.

Our privilege of working with these men in common community efforts has served to increase our respect for our National Government and those who serve as national leaders. The care in selection and the intensity of training and the community orientation which this group so exemplifies reflects the greatest credit on the U.S. Government and its elected servants.

Details of the many rescue efforts during which the detachment 4 personnel gave assistance fill a cubic foot of our records, equal to several volumes of print. It is impractical to attempt to describe every incident and the dangers encountered and surmounted. However, I think it might be useful to describe generally the terrain and the types of involvement.

Snohomish County is approximately 2,200 miles in area, with a western coastal area on Puget Sound and an eastern area extending to the summit of the Cascades and including great stretches of national forest divided by numerous high peaks and rocky escarpments. The Cascades receive the very considerable rainfall generated in the neighboring Pacific so that our county must carry the runoff in its two principal river systems, the Skykomish-Snohomish and the Stillaguamish, and the numerous small contributing rivers. All of the rivers are subject to flooding. The abundance of water

and natural barriers have also created many lakes.

A characteristic of all of our rivers is a very rapid current. This naturally follows from the rather short distance of roughly 50 miles from the summit of the 8,000- to 10,000-foot Cascades to the sea.

The abundance of water and its rapid runoff together have created a mountain condition of heavy forest blanket and deep stream erosion. Very little of the high mountain area can be fairly described as hospitable to 'copters. The Pacific provides us with fairly brisk winds, and the mountains have their own vigorous thermal currents.

Snohomish County has an estimated population itself of some 232,000 people, and lies immediately adjacent to King County with over a million. The terrain of the county constitutes a first-class tourist and vacationer attraction, so that the number of people stumbling about on the average weekend is astounding. Even experienced mountaineers find it extraordinarily easy to slip and slide on our well-greased slopes into almost inconceivable positions of danger, usually damaging their skeletal structures so as to interfere with easy walking.

In extricating these folk we have seen our friends from Paine Field maneuver their machines just a yard or two over the rivers and lakes, between the trees, under and around our telephone and electric wires, into and out of tiny canyons—one of which they actually had to back out of for lack of any other possible escape—within inches of rocky cliffs and pinnacles, and out over our very wet ocean. Many, many of these maneuvers were accomplished in high wind, cloud, fog, mist, falling light, or heavy rain, and frequently a combination of these.

We have added, as exhibits, some pictures and some news stories illustrating and explaining a small part of their work as we have known it. I am sending you this letter and material so that there will be some record of their achievements other than our own files. Most of the men named here are transferring to new stations in the next week or two so that the time seems appropriate to note their records while here.

A copy of this letter and its enclosures is being sent to our two Senators and our Congressman. These men, of course, are fully aware of the contributions given by detachment 4 and I believe they would be willing to confirm the facts as I have presented them.

Respectfully,  
DONALD F. JENNINGS,  
Sheriff.

#### DRAFT EMPHASIZES NEED FOR NEW GI EDUCATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the stark realities of existence in our world today point to an extended period of American military preparedness. With the constant increase in political tensions throughout the world and with the consequent addition of responsibility upon the shoulders of our Armed Forces personnel the need for educational readjustment assistance for cold war veterans is magnified. We are calling 27,400 men for the month of September 1965, and 33,600 men for the month of October 1965, through the Selective Service System. If we call these young men from home and school to fight for and defend American freedom we cannot fail to extend them an opportunity to begin again on their journey to intellectual and technical attainment when they return from service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mr. Edgar F. Peterson, of Tuscaloosa, Ala., dated September 10, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1965.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YARBOROUGH: This letter is in regard to educational aid for cold war veterans after February 1, 1955. Since I am a cold war veteran, I feel that the passage of an educational aid bill would be of great help to me and other veterans in obtaining a better education.

I am one of many cold war veterans who served during the Lebanon crisis. I was drafted from my science teaching job, but I was happy to serve my country as were other cold war veterans. During this time, my chances to continue my education were hindered as it was for many other veterans.

I feel that one of the best ways the Government can help the people of the United States is by providing for better educated citizens. The expense involved will be paid back in a few years through more income tax revenue. I feel that many of the billions being spent for foreign aid could be spent for the improving of our own country.

Since I have been reading the controversial issues on this educational aid bill, I would like to drop this letter to you in support of the educational aid bill for cold war veterans since 1955. I will greatly appreciate your continued support of this bill, and I'm sure other cold war veterans will appreciate your support of this bill.

Yours very truly,

EDGAR F. PETERSON.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S REMARKS ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a wise and eloquent statement to scholars of 80 nations attending the bicentennial celebration of the Smithsonian Institution President Johnson developed the theme, in his words, that "history is made by man and the ideas of men."

The President pointed out that education is the foundation both of our hopes for a Great Society in America and for the enrichment of life throughout the world. Learning, said the President, "is basic to our hopes for America. It is the taproot which gives sustaining life to all our purposes." This Nation's dream of a Great Society, he added, "is not just an American dream. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute to it."

In his remarks President Johnson develops the theme that education is the key to programs for the health and happiness of our own people, to our hopes for world peace, and to hopes for a better life for the hundreds of millions of people around the world who live in desperate poverty.

With these considerations in mind, President Johnson has directed a special task force to recommend a plan of worldwide educational endeavor. Having accomplished more for education within the United States than any of his predecessors, President Johnson is now directing his thoughts and his energies to the needs of international education. This is indeed a most happy development, and

one for which the President is to be highly commended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that President Johnson's remarks to the international gathering of scholars attending the Smithsonian bicentennial celebration be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distinguished scholars from 80 nations, amid this pomp and pageantry we have gathered to celebrate a man about whom we know very little but to whom we owe very much. James Smithson was a scientist who achieved no great distinction. He was an Englishman who never visited the United States. He never even expressed a desire to do so.

But this man became our Nation's first great benefactor. He gave his entire fortune to establish this Institution which would serve "for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men."

He had a vision which lifted him ahead of his time—or at least of some politicians of his time. One illustrious U.S. Senator argued that it was "beneath the dignity of the country to accept such gifts from foreigners." Congress debated 8 long years before deciding to receive Smithson's bequest.

Yet James Smithson's life and legacy brought meaning to three ideas more powerful than anyone at that time ever dreamed.

The first idea was that learning respects no geographic boundaries. The Institution bearing his name became the very first agency in the United States to promote scientific and scholarly exchange with all the nations of the world.

The second idea was that partnership between Government and private enterprise can serve the greater good of both. The Smithsonian Institution started a new kind of venture in this country, chartered by act of Congress, maintained by both public funds and private contributions. It inspired a relationship which has grown and flowered in a thousand different ways.

Finally, the institution financed by Smithson breathed life in the idea that the growth and spread of learning must be the first work of a nation that seeks to be free.

These ideas have not always gained easy acceptance among those employed in my line of work. The Government official must cope with the daily disorder he finds in the world around him.

But today, the official, the scholar and the scientist cannot settle for limited objectives. We must pursue knowledge no matter what the consequences. We must value the tried less than the true.

To split the atom, to launch the rocket, to explore the innermost mysteries and the outermost reaches of the universe—these are your God-given chores. Even when you risk bringing fresh disorder to the politics of men and nations, these explorations must go on.

The men who founded our country were passionate believers in the revolutionary power of ideas.

They knew that once a nation commits itself to the increase and diffusion of knowledge, the real revolution begins. It can never be stopped.

In my own life, I have had cause again and again to bless the chance events which started me as a teacher. In our country and in our time we have recognized, with new passion, that learning is basic to our hopes for America. It is the taproot which gives sustaining life to all our purposes. Whatever we seek to do—to wage the war on poverty, set new goals for health and happiness, curb crime, and bring beauty to our cities and countryside—all these and more depend on education.

But the legacy we inherit from James Smithson cannot be limited to these shores.

He called for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men—not just Americans, not just Anglo-Saxons, not just the citizens of the Western World, but all men everywhere.

The world we face on his bicentennial anniversary makes that mandate more urgent than it ever was. For we know today that certain truths are self-evident in every nation on this earth:

That ideas, not armaments, will shape our lasting prospects for peace.

That the conduct of our foreign policy will advance no faster than the curriculum of our classrooms.

That the knowledge of our citizens is the one treasure which grows only when it is shared.

It would profit us little to limit the world's exchange to those who can afford it. We must extend the treasure to those lands where learning is still a luxury for the few.

Today, more than 700 million adults—4 out of 10 of the world's population—dwell in darkness where they cannot read or write. Almost half the nations of this globe suffer from illiteracy among half or more of their people. Unless the world can find a way to extend the light, the force of that darkness may engulf us all.

For our part, this Government and this Nation is prepared to join in finding the way. During recent years we have made many hopeful beginnings. But we can and we must do more. That is why I have directed a special task force within my administration to recommend a broad and long-range plan of worldwide educational endeavor. I intend to call on leading educators outside the Government to join with us.

We must move ahead on every front and at every level of learning. We can support Secretary Ripley's dream of creating a center of advanced study here at the Smithsonian so that great scholars from every nation will come and collaborate. At a more junior level, we can promote the growth of the school-to-school program started under Peace Corps auspices so that our children may learn about, and care about, each other.

We mean to show that this Nation's dream of a Great Society does not stop at the water's edge. It is not just an American dream. All are welcome to share in it. All are invited to contribute to it.

Together we must embark on a new and noble adventure:

First, to assist the education efforts of the developing nations and the developing regions.

Second, to help our schools and universities increase their knowledge of the world and the people who inhabit it.

Third, to advance the exchange of students and teachers who travel and work outside their native lands.

Fourth, to increase the free flow of books and ideas and art, of works of science and imagination.

And, fifth, to assemble meetings of men and women from every discipline and every culture to ponder the common problems of mankind.

In all these endeavors, I pledge that the United States will play its full role.

By January, I intend to present such a program to Congress.

Despite the noise of daily events, history is made by men and the ideas of men. We, and only we, can generate growing light in our universe, or we can allow the darkness to gather.

DeToqueville challenged us more than a century ago: "Men cannot remain strangers to each other or be ignorant of what is taking place in any corner of the globe." We must banish the strangeness and the ignorance.

In all we do toward one another we must try, and try again, to live the words of the prophet: "I shall light a candle of understanding in thine heart which shall not be put out."



# THE EAST-WEST CENTER ON THE UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII CAMPUS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, more than 600 students from 25 countries were enrolled at the East-West Center on the University of Hawaii campus in Honolulu last year.

I know that many of my colleagues will be surprised to learn that this Federal institution which was established to promote better understanding and cooperation between East and West is already 5 years old.

The Honolulu Advertiser published some interesting comments on the development of the East-West Center in a September 15 editorial. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## EAST-WEST CENTER AT 5

There is the theory that underdeveloped nations can reach a point after initial years of struggle, inexperience, and building when their economy takes hold and starts generating its own growth. This is called "the take-off stage" of development.

And so it might be with the East-West Center 5 years after its first student grantee arrived on the University of Hawaii campus.

Nobody who has followed the Center's growth would pretend these initial years have been either easy or uncontroversial.

Looking back, it might have been naive to expect otherwise, just as it would be naive to expect the world's new nations to emerge with fully matured development.

The East-West Center is a unique experiment, not only in international relations but also in American education. It is the first such Federally sponsored institution for civilians.

Furthermore, it was founded as Hawaii was beginning to move into an era of sweeping change.

The jet age and statehood had just arrived with a dramatic rush. There has been ferment and turnover since in the University of Hawaii itself as it started to move into its own take off stage toward becoming a first-class institution with a deeper understanding of Asia.

Yet, if the Center has admittedly disappointed some in its initial development, it would be a mistake not to acknowledge its early accomplishments.

Its student program has grown from 99 students from 14 countries in that first fall semester of 1960 to over 600 from 25 countries last year.

Its technical training program—providing special practical courses in such fields as agriculture, printing, public health, and radio broadcasting—has served another 1,000 grantees.

The third major division, the Institute of Advanced Projects, has provided grants and facilities for 133 Asian and American senior scholars to do research and write on international problems.

In addition, the institute has sponsored a series of important international development seminars which have brought dozens of East-West experts together for discussions of major problems.

Along the way, the Center and the university have worked out a relationship based on practical experience and better understanding. In this, some feel it was a blessing as well as a personal burden that university President Thomas Hamilton was forced by circumstances to spend over a year as the Center's acting chancellor.

If the Center has yet to achieve major world stature, there is the balancing thought

that educational institutions, unlike movie or recording stars, are best inclined to build their image in a slower, more solid form.

And there is also the fact that increasing numbers of Asian and Pacific island students have received degrees and gone back with generally favorable impressions. The Center is succeeding in its major function, promoting better East-West understanding.

This certainly does not mean that major improvements and the real potential of the Center do not lie ahead.

We now have the basis for the takeoff stage—improved understanding with Washington, smoother relations with the university, and in Howard P. Jones, a new full-time chancellor with wide experience and knowledge of Asia and its problems.

This makes it especially fortunate that the executive committee of the Center's distinguished National Board of Review has been here this week to study programs and activities.

This group includes the Very Reverend Laurence McGinley, former president of Fordham University and chairman of the executive committee; Roy Larsen, chairman of the executive committee of Time magazine; Dr. Hugh Borton, president of Haverford College, and Hawaii's Dr. Hung Wo Ching, chairman of the board of Aloha Airlines.

Gov. John A. Burns, who was instrumental in the founding of the Center and is chairman of the National Review Board, joined in the committee sessions here.

Father McGinley has praised the Center's achievements amid difficulties and stressed its high potential.

We are certain his committee members are also aware of continuing problems; these will be pointed out to Center officials and to members of the full National Review Board meeting in January.

Their findings and their perspective are important as the Center emerges from its first difficult years and into a period in history when the East-West understanding and cooperation it seeks may well become the most critical need in our world.

## TRIBUTE TO ADLAI STEVENSON

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, time is allowing us to better assess and appreciate the many wonderful contributions which Adlai Stevenson made to the future of this Nation and to the progress of the entire world. The grief and shock of his death is slowly yielding to a deepening appreciation of the wonderful character of this man, the conscience of America, and the manifold accomplishments of a man who left the world in a better condition than he entered it, due mainly to his own abilities and convictions.

As a tribute to his passing, I ask unanimous consent that two articles from the Progressive magazine of August 1965, which appear on pages 3 and 4, being an editorial and an article by Donald Grant as well as a resolution which was passed by the Texas Democratic Women's State Committee, together with the authenticating signatures, and the cover letter accompanying it, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Progressive magazine, August 1965]

## ADLAI EWING STEVENSON

More than any political leader in our time, Adlai Stevenson spoke for the conscience of America. It will take time to as-

sess and appreciate the most important things that Adlai Stevenson did for us and said to us. It may well be as important as life and death for civilization as we know it that we soon grasp and act upon the wisdom of his words, and honor him with the only memorial commensurate with the man—peace on earth.

In 1956, at the height of his second campaign for President, he had the courage to propose that the United States suspend nuclear testing. He was excoriated as a dreamer—and later vindicated by an Eisenhower administration that suspended testing; eventually, he was vindicated a second time by the signing of the treaty banning atomic testing under the Kennedy administration.

Long before poverty became popular Stevenson proposed programs designed to eliminate poverty; and he spoke up for civil rights at a most critical place and time—Little Rock, Ark., a decade ago.

John F. Kennedy's thinking was in part reshaped by the mind of Adlai Stevenson, just as Stevenson expanded the horizons of men and women who have been elected to the Congress of the United States, to Governors' offices, or who have won renown in halls of learning and on the councils of diplomacy.

Viewed in its entirety, Stevenson's public life equals that of any public man in American history for courage, high principle, selfless commitment, and the ability to conceive great plans for the betterment of his countrymen and all humanity. It was his capacity to create new ideas that should be remembered most. Those who ignore this fact and dwell largely upon his wit and eloquence understand neither the man nor what he was trying to do.

Three times—in 1952, 1956, and in the vain attempt to nominate him in 1960—the Progressive supported Adlai Stevenson for President. It was not that we agreed with every detail of his program. In 1952 the editorial in the Progressive announcing its endorsement of Stevenson for President was entitled "Adlai, Warts and All," and we found a number of warts. Again in 1956 our support of Stevenson was tempered with reservations, especially on some of his views on foreign policy.

But there was a quality in Adlai Stevenson that irresistibly overcame differences in detail. It was his basic approach to the real and ever-changing problems of mankind, an approach eloquently stated by Stevenson himself in a memorable address in 1959:

"An examination of what you might call our collective conscience is to my mind far more important than particular projects or programs. You can have a perfect assembly of pieces in your watch, but they are worthless if the mainspring is broken."

It was his deep and noble humility, his recognition of the need for constant soul-searching, and his willingness to adopt fresh ideas on the basis of new-found knowledge that we found so appealing in Stevenson. It was this depth of character that made Stevenson, a loser in national elections, a winner in the more vital race of man against his own destructive nature.

Stevenson's two defeats at the hands of Dwight D. Eisenhower were tragic for the country, but even in defeat Stevenson began the education of millions of his countrymen on behalf of ideals far nobler than affluence and armaments. It was the Stevensonian education of millions of voters that helped make the election of John F. Kennedy possible, made the election of Barry Goldwater impossible, and truly laid the foundations for what is best in the New Frontier and the Great Society.

We believe that if Adlai Stevenson had lived, he might yet have performed at least one more great service to peace. He might have chosen—if the White House persisted in widening the war in Vietnam—to break free,

regretfully, from the restrictions placed upon him as the administration's ambassador to the United Nations. He might have resigned his U.N. post, as many of his admirers across the land wanted him to do. Then, as a member of the loyal opposition, he could have spoken truth to power. With his independence regained, his ideas might have acquired enough weight with the White House to require it to modify some of its perilous and fruitless foreign policies.

It was clear that Stevenson was deeply troubled in his role as our ambassador to the United Nations. His inner conflict was well known to his close friends. He disagreed with several aspects of the Johnson administration's foreign policy—positions he was obliged to defend before the world community against his better judgment. According to radio correspondent David Schoenbrun, Stevenson, a few days before his death, told roving ambassador Averell Harriman that U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic was a massive blunder and that defense of that policy "took several years off my life. I could not believe in some of the things I had to say." Several weeks before Stevenson's death, James A. Weschler, in the New York Post, wrote of Stevenson's association with the Johnson administration, "Too often Stevenson is reduced to the role of debater rather than creator." In a warm note to Weschler, Stevenson wryly responded: "There you touch the nerve with precision." But he stayed on because he felt his country needed him.

Certainly the world is a more dangerous place without Adlai Stevenson. But his words and ideals can still speak to us if we have the wit to listen. That compassionate and brave and often lonely man is gone forever, and yet his hopes for, and belief in, the human race would be justified if his death were to begin a new flowering of the American conscience and a new dedication to peace and the betterment of our brothers everywhere.

[From Progressive magazine, August 1965]

#### A WALK WITH STEVENSON

(By Donald Grant)

(NOTE.—Donald Grant, United Nations correspondent for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, was a close friend and confidant of Adlai Stevenson.)

UNITED NATIONS.—This is written on the day that Adlai Ewing Stevenson died.

I am looking down the street where I walked with him so recently. That was after breakfast at his apartment in the Waldorf Towers. I scrambled the eggs; typically, he had given his cook time off for some reason of personal need. There were dirty dishes in the kitchen sink. His driver also was off for the day—it was, after all, a Saturday. Hence our walk to the building which houses the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, just across the street from the United Nations itself.

After he left me, Stevenson—"Governor," we called him—was going to write the speech, or a draft of the speech he hoped would be delivered by President Johnson at the San Francisco session of the United Nations General Assembly commemorating the 20th anniversary of the world organization Stevenson helped found.

Walking beside me, Stevenson's step was full of bounce, and so were his ideas. Our breakfast talk had ranged over a wide variety of subjects—the future of the United Nations, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, relations with Russia and with China, and more. As we walked to his office he brought all this into focus on a single suggestion.

"I have been thinking," he said, "of going to Moscow myself, to see if something could be done about the problem of communications between the Soviet Union and the United States. I feel I have good relations

with [Soviet President Anastas] Mikoyan and I do believe something must be done."

We had talked at breakfast about the lack of meaningful discussion between the two great nuclear powers. Stevenson was convinced that the future of peace depended on improved relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. On a previous occasion he had told me of his conversations with President Johnson on the China problem. This, of course, included Vietnam. Stevenson felt the United States and the Soviet Union had many interests, especially in holding China within bounds of reason until the processes of time and maturity could work with that vast country, now so isolated, so unrelated to the general system of collective security.

This was one of many items of unfinished business with Adlai Stevenson when he died.

I followed Stevenson to San Francisco. The first night there, the night before President Johnson spoke, I saw Stevenson at the big reception given all the delegates. He was a sobered man, his face twisted with an inner pain; he knew then that President Johnson had rejected his suggestions of ideas to be included in the Presidential speech, and he told me so, adding, "Maybe there will be a last-minute change." There wasn't any.

Until the last minute, Stevenson had hoped Mr. Johnson would give some real assurance that the United Nations General Assembly would resume normal sessions this fall, that the issue of voting by nations refusing to contribute to peacekeeping operations which they believed were illegal would not be raised. Stevenson had never been in full accord with the American policy which threatened the voting rights of two great powers, Russia and France, and hence the future of the whole United Nations. It was a complex issue, and Stevenson never thought American policy wholly wrong, but he was not one to kill flies with sledgehammers.

The world organization, Stevenson thought, was more important than legalistic arguments. By the time of the San Francisco meeting, in any event, Stevenson, along with most U.N. diplomats, believed the issue was dead. He also believed it would give the United Nations a much needed stimulant for the President to make an appropriate statement on the subject.

So far as I could judge, Stevenson was not bitter, afterwards. He was confident the U.N. Assembly, anyway, would resume normal sessions this fall. If he knew why the President had rejected his advice—that Mr. Johnson include in his speech reaffirmation of American support for collective security generally, and of U.N. political and economic functions in particular—Stevenson never told me. The speech given by the President, though containing some sentiments apparently favorable to the United Nations, was greeted by Stevenson's diplomatic colleagues, and by his staff, as a slap in the face for the chief U.S. delegate.

It is no secret that Stevenson was to one degree or another out of sympathy with the "shoot-first-and-talk-later" style of Johnsonian diplomacy. Bombing North Vietnam, landing the Marines in the Dominican Republic, bringing Belgian parachutists into the Congo in American planes were not in the Stevenson manner. Last fall he carried, with his strong recommendations for approval, a proposal for peace talks in Vietnam from U.N. Secretary General U Thant to President Johnson, who promptly rejected the suggestion, which already had the support of Ho Chi Minh of Hanoi. After the Dominican landings, Stevenson urged in vain that U.S. influence be used to return Juan Bosch, the legally elected president, to power in Santo Domingo. Johnson remained deaf.

Too frequently, Stevenson's friends thought, Johnson did not consult Stevenson

until after decisions were made—and too often refused to accept his advice when Stevenson found an opportunity to give it. Why, then, did Stevenson reject the advice of friends who urged him to resign?

A swift answer may be misleading. No doubt Stevenson's own personality was involved. He was not a simple man, nor a man free from doubts, divisions, and possibly unrealistic hopes. He was an eminently reasonable man, given to an inordinate faith, perhaps, in human intelligence. If one could divest the word of a tendency toward cliché—as alien to Stevenson as an affront to the dignity of any fellow human creature—the term "good" might apply as well. Out of his own goodness, he found it impossible to impute "evil" to his enemies, either inside the Johnson administration or elsewhere.

His function, Stevenson felt, was to pull together the goodness in all men, the yearning for peace, for justice; to help all men to achieve the good life his brain and his heart told him was possible for mankind. The "revolution of rising expectations"—a phrase he invented—took place in the first instance inside Stevenson, and he learned to expect much of his fellow man, whether a President Johnson, a Mikoyan—or, I think, a Mao Tse-tung.

He was not always disappointed. Out of two defeats in national presidential campaigns he gained the respect of the world. Hoping to be President Kennedy's Secretary of State, he settled for the position of United Nations Ambassador—only to find that he had not been properly informed about the invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs and mistakenly made statements about American innocence not consistent with facts later revealed. He did not resign then. In the Cuban missile crisis he was able to play a major, though largely quiet, role in avoiding nuclear war.

Later, partly as a result of the surmounting of that crisis, President Kennedy at American University announced a policy for the United States that was "Stevensonian" in essence—moving forward toward a detente with the Soviet Union and strengthening American participation in the United Nations.

Under Johnson, Stevenson kept hoping: There are many roads to Damascus.

There also are various kinds of immortality. So soon after his death, it is impossible not to believe that Stevenson has led us in a direction we can follow for ourselves, now. We must try.

As I was writing this, I received a telephone call from a very humble Indian—the personal servant of a diplomat with the Indian delegation at the United Nations. He had served Stevenson at receptions; he knew Stevenson was my friend.

"Is it true?" asked the Indian. And when I sadly assured him it was, he asked, "Who will help us keep the peace from now on?"

WALLER, TEX.,

September 9, 1965.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senator,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the last meeting of the Texas Democratic Women's State Committee, a resolution was proposed in tribute to Adlai Stevenson.

We were asked to send you a copy.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET READING.

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas Adlai Stevenson brought to the world of politics a sense of truth, of sincerity and beauty of the English language. These qualities together with his wit and understanding furnished an effective leadership. He raised us all to a greater maturity and gave us all a greater understanding of the peoples of the world; and



Whereas he helped in the formation of the United Nations and was later the U.S. Ambassador to that body. Death came while on a United Nations' assignment. He died in the active service of his country; and

Whereas his death is a great loss to all of the world, but his greatness will be felt for ages to come: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Texas Democratic Women's State Committee pay tribute to the life and service of Adlai Stevenson, outstanding citizen of the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be prepared and sent to the United Nations and that copies be prepared for members of his family as an expression of sympathy and in recognition of the greatness of Adlai Ewing Stevenson.

MARGARET READING.  
LILLIAN COLLIER.

#### IZAACK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA HONOR ROLL AWARD TO THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Izaak Walton League of America this week presented its Honor Roll Award to the League of Women Voters for the league's work in conservation, outdoor recreation, and pollution abatement.

The League of Women Voters is a volunteer nonpartisan organization of 145,000 persons with local leagues in every State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

The league has made intelligent studies in many facets of our Government, and it has made extremely helpful contributions in the area of interest in which it is honored by the Izaak Walton League.

I feel particular pride in this latest recognition, in that the national president of the League of Women Voters is a constituent of mine, Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, of Spokane, Wash. She is providing this organization with most able leadership.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the press release issued by the Izaak Walton League of America on the occasion of this award.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, September 19.—The League of Women Voters of the United States was cited today by the Izaak Walton League of America for its effective leadership and activity in conservation, outdoor recreation and pollution abatement. The Izaak Walton honor roll award was presented to Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, Spokane, Wash., president of the national women's group by Reynolds Harnsberger, Markham, Va., national president of the sportsman-conservation organization.

Harnsberger in making the award commented that studies in recent years had shown that a substantial portion of all outdoor recreation activity is water-related—swimming, fishing, boating, camping, picnicking, waterfowl hunting and on down the long list. "It is perfectly plain," he said, "that if we want to assure an adequate supply of high-quality outdoor recreation opportunity to meet the needs of our burgeoning population, we must conserve and protect the Nation's vital water resources."

"It has been stated, and without exaggeration," he continued, "that if all water pollution were eliminated, the usable outdoor recreation potentials of the United States would be doubled."

"The League of Women Voters," Harnsberger emphasized, "has mobilized its membership to study, become informed and to act vigorously and intelligently in behalf of clean water. The League's contribution to outdoor recreation and community well-being across the Nation has been immeasurable."

#### VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY'S ADDRESS AT THE URBAN DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, our distinguished Vice President and President of the Senate addressed the Urban Development Seminar, sponsored by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and Agency for International Development at Detroit on September 15.

As always, the Vice President effectively raises our vision and points the road which as a people we should follow if we seek to realize the potentials that are ours and advance the interest of mankind.

I ask unanimous consent that the address may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, URBAN DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR, SPONSORED BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, SEPTEMBER 15, 1965

We Americans have been more urban than rural since 1920. But as you know, it was only this summer that we fully accepted this fact and established a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

This doesn't mean we haven't been working on urban problems for a long time. As mayor of Minneapolis, I worried about financing school expansion, improving housing, carving playgrounds and parks out of packed city blocks, about highways and bus service, and building a tax base to pay for the things our people had to have.

As a Member of the U.S. Senate I continued to work toward providing for these same needs.

Today, as Vice President, I act as the President's liaison with mayors, city managers, and local government—with the people who deal day to day with the problems of urban America.

Our new Department of Housing and Urban Development will make possible coordination of Federal programs for the cities—it will serve as a focal point for what we are doing.

With this new Department, I believe we'll do a better job of designing cities, of meeting problems like mass transit and water supply, of improving welfare programs, of providing educational opportunity—of making our cities places to live in and not to escape from.

Our rich and strong country is today dedicated to this task, and to the task, in all our society, of helping create a life of both quality and quantity, a life in which each man has the equal opportunity to build something better for himself, his children, his country.

And your objectives, I suspect, are not too greatly different. But your nations do not have our wealth and strength, your nations do not have as ready access to human and material resources. And, therefore, your task is even more difficult than ours.

Looking at our own economic assistance programs—at the kinds of things we're doing in partnership with other countries—I think it is clear that we have begun to place a much

higher priority than we once did on urban development as a major concern in the problem of nation building.

As recently as 5 years ago, you would have had a hard time finding many AID projects that could be called part of an urban development program.

The need was right before our eyes: people by the millions were streaming in from the rural areas in Bombay and Caracas and Cairo, running from the poverty they knew on the farm to the opportunity they thought beckoned in the city. But as recently as that, there was a feeling on your part and on ours that things like housing were luxury investments that would have to wait on the building of more factories, more powerplants and more roads. Housing, so they said, wasn't productive.

But that's not true. You can build houses and community centers and schools and clinics with local materials. It takes little precious foreign exchange. The biggest cost in laying sewers or water mains is labor. As far as being productive is concerned, in the United States the home-building industry is responsible for one out of every \$18 of our national product, and it provides jobs for 1 out of every 20 Americans.

And it is anything but productive to sit by and permit the mushrooming of miles of slums and shacks, crowded with sick and illiterate and miserable human beings whose very misery makes them receptive to any proposal, however violent and destructive, that seems to promise some hope.

In the last 5 years we have come quite a distance. The increase in AID assistance for urban development is remarkable, especially in Latin America under the Alliance for Progress. AID alone has made more than \$150 million in loans for housing construction and more than \$200 million has been loaned by the Inter-American Development Bank.

To get private American capital investment in international housing, the Congress has given AID authority to make \$400 million in housing investments guarantees for Latin America, and reserved another \$125 million in guarantee authority for housing investments in Asia and Africa. Right now, private American investors are using this authority to launch joint housing ventures in Taiwan, Thailand, Nigeria, and Tunisia.

By themselves, the raw statistics of what we have achieved seem impressive. In fiscal year 1965 for example, the U.S. AID program helped other countries add decent dwelling units for 680,000 people, 470,000 of these in Latin America. Compared with what was happening 5 years ago that is impressive. But compared with the need it is hardly a start. I know of no developing country in which the construction of new, decent housing has yet kept pace with the raw increase in urban population.

If there is cause of optimism it is not because of the statistical results to date, but because of what lies behind these statistics. I am encouraged by the growth of institutions and programs that will make a decent home economically possible for more and more people in the less developed countries.

The growth of savings and loan associations in Latin America, for example, has been remarkable, and I'm proud of the role that private American groups like the National League of Insured Savings Associations and the U.S. Savings and Loan League have played in this growth through the AID program. In Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Venezuela, and Guatemala alone, 70 associations have been organized with more than 200,000 members, \$55 million in savings and \$99 million in loans out for the purchase of new homes.

To me, the experience with savings and loan associations, with credit unions, and with housing cooperatives now being organized with the support of American labor unions, makes it clear that the local funds

to finance much of the needed urban housing are present, if they can only be mobilized.

I'm encouraged too, by the success of self-help housing programs in countries as distant and diverse as Nicaragua, Nigeria, and Korea. The very poor have no buried savings to share in a cooperative or a savings and loan association, but they can contribute their own labor. This device has cut costs by as much as 40 percent, and it has given the people who live in these houses a sense of participation and dignity that may be as important as the home itself.

Our commitment to help with the problems of urban development is a firm one. But it is also clear to us, as I'm sure it is to you, that the problems of the growing city can be solved only partially within the city itself.

In the 15 years or so since the beginning of our partnership for development with your countries and other countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the pattern and the problems of progress have become fairly clear. We have seen some great achievements. Together, we have very nearly wiped out the threat of malaria for half the 1.3 billion people in the malarious areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. We've done pretty well at building factories and putting up powerplants. Industrial output has increased at an average of better than 6 percent a year.

But farm output, in nearly every one of the less-developed countries, has barely kept pace with the increase in population. In many of your countries, it has fallen behind, despite sizable investments in fertilizer imports and factories, in rural roads, in irrigation projects.

The result is more than food shortages in the cities. The result is rural poverty and the flight of more people to the cities. In most of your countries, rural people still account for better than two-thirds of the population. If the farmers are not producing more, if their incomes are not rising, where is the growing internal market to provide more orders for urban factories, more jobs for city people?

It is clear to us that we are also going to have to pay far more attention in our assistance programs to raising agricultural output. There is no other way to ease the pressure of migration on your cities, or broaden the internal markets that will create more city jobs.

In his message this year on the foreign assistance program, President Johnson pledged the United States to use its own agricultural abundance and technical skills to help the less-developed countries increase their own ability to produce food of their own.

Some of the steps involved are obvious: more fertilizer, better produce distribution, improved pricing practices, more irrigation. We in the United States are going to make better, more extensive use through the AID program of our own unique experience in agricultural development by involving our land grant universities and our own Department of Agriculture specialists. We are continuing to expand our use of experts from American farm cooperative groups in helping other countries raise farm productivity.

We can't reproduce our own American experience in your country. Countries are different and you can't transfer institutions willy-nilly. But we can provide wonderfully skilled people from our universities, our cooperatives, our Agriculture Department to help work out solutions that do make sense in another situation. If we persist together, I don't doubt for a moment that we will turn up on the farms and in the villages the same buried resources of human drive and ingenuity, and maybe even a good deal of capital, that the savings and loan experiment has turned up in the Latin American countries I mentioned earlier.

As you may know, I have something of a reputation as an optimist. Well, I am. It is

easy to be discouraged by the troubles of men and nations. Certainly we're all sobered by what's happening in India and Pakistan today. And Vietnam is disturbing and tragic. For, while men are at war, we can't get on with the most important human battle in southeast Asia: the battle to develop the promise of a rich and fertile land for the people who live there.

But when I look back on our common history since World War II, what I'm impressed with is not the troubles or the problems—the world has always had those. I'm impressed with the new element in international relations: the steady effort, crystallized in our mutual development programs, our aid programs, by independent countries to work together on solving problems.

That is new, and different, and a cause for optimism.

For our part, I can assure you that we approach our role in the development partnership in the same way we have learned to view our investment in the development of our own cities. We don't see this as something we are doing for somebody else. We see it as an investment in our own future and in the world we share with you.

In closing, may I say this: The American character is one of activism and, sometimes, impatience. It is one which leads us, from time to time, into mistakes. It is one, I am sure, which is often not fully understood in other places.

But I want to leave this message with you: We Americans are committed—committed beyond recall—to the building of a freer, better, happier world for all men.

There have been times, I know, when you may have doubted this. But today, as never before, our American Nation has come to appreciate the oneness of mankind. This appreciation makes possible the great national programs we undertake today to build better cities, to fight poverty, to eliminate discrimination in our own society, to do something on behalf of our fellow men.

And today, as never before, we know that we cannot live rich in a world too long poor.

I, for one, mean to do in my lifetime whatever I can to extend mankind's benefits to more of mankind. And I am joined by the overwhelming majority of the American people. I am joined, certainly, by our President.

Let us, then, together pledge ourselves to creating the world of justice, hope and peace that all men long for, but have not yet achieved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who is to be recognized to make some remarks at this time, will yield without losing the right to the floor or having the

time for the quorum call taken out of the time allotted to him, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Ohio.

#### THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate within the last few days there has been a discussion of what the conditions were in the Dominican Republic in April, when the U.S. Government determined to send in its Marines. A statement was made that an erroneous judgment was reached by the President because he was misinformed as to the purpose in sending in the troops. I must express vigorous disagreement with that argument.

I am a member of the Foreign Relations Committee and had the opportunity of listening to the representatives of the Department of Defense, the State Department, and the CIA in describing what took place in the Dominican Republic when the revolt of last spring began.

I can say unhesitatingly to Senators on the floor of the Senate that the proof was clear and convincing that unless we had stepped in we would have at our shores another Cuba.

We know of the difficulties that are facing us because of Cuba. In my judgment, those difficulties would be multiplied many times if another Castro and Cuba were established within 100 miles of the banks of our land on the south.

When the coup began it was led by persons who were not connected with the Communist Party. But it is an established fact that there were three groups in Cuba.

One group was known as the 14th of June movement with complete fidelity to Castro. Its members obtained guerrilla training in Cuba, especially in the year of 1964. That group is oriented to Castro and is Communist. It is the largest of the extremists parties, but does contain some non-Communist members.

The second group, that was latent and hidden in the Dominican Republic, was the PSPD, oriented to Moscow. Its members received training in Czechoslovakia in 1963. Others obtained indoctrination in Moscow in 1964.

Then, there was a third group, the APCJ, oriented to Peiping. Members of the APCJ went to Communist China late in 1964, where they received guerrilla military training.

We thus have the situation with three groups in the Dominican Republic led by Communists, with some of their members non-Communists. They were hidden, waiting for action. When the coup began, they immediately sprung to the forefront, and within a few days they



were occupying the leading positions in what was happening.

When the military members of the coup began distributing arms, these three Communist oriented organizations were in the frontline. Their leaders were distributing military equipment, and they were seen at vital places in command. All of the indications were that they were practically in control.

Military equipment was delivered to them in large quantities and taken to their headquarters, where it was distributed to their members, many of whom were Communists, and others who did not know exactly what was in the making.

There has been some criticism, particularly in the press, about the relatively small number of Communists identified as having taken part in the rebellion in the Dominican Republic.

In my judgment we miss the seriousness of the revolutionary situation by adding up the number of Communists that were identified in it.

When we add the number, we completely miss the point about the ability of Communist leaders to dominate a situation where disorder, rioting, and mob rule prevails. By skilled manipulation, propaganda, by assertion of leadership in proper points, in street fighting, by aggressive activity, these Communists take hold. That is what they did in the Dominican Republic.

A few skilled people can do this in the proper circumstances. In the Dominican Republic the circumstances were existent, enabling the Communists to seize the leadership, and to install their government.

When a temporary government was established in April, in charge of the investigative forces, there was placed at its head the most ardent Communist of the whole group.

That is a technique of Communist activity which is generally understood: Get control of the police; get control of the investigating agency; and when there is control of them, begin arresting all citizens who are in disagreement with the party in control who have the potential ability of interfering.

I merely want to remind Senators of what has happened in Cuba. Castro immediately arrested 500 of the leaders whom he thought would cause trouble to him. He had a hippodrome trial. The 500 persons were put to death under the semblance of the administration of justice, when it was nothing but the act of a tyrant, giving the semblance of a trial to the accused, with all judgments foreordained, and then putting them to death.

I have already stated that the man that was placed at the head of the investigative forces was one of the leading Communists in the Dominican Republic.

But one word about the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. They were called by the chairman of the committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. The committee did not make the decision to hold the hearings.

I regret to say this, but it is nevertheless my judgment, that the meeting was

contemplated to establish that we were in the Dominican Republic by error and injustice.

Someone had prepared a sheaf of cards, I should say 1½ inches thick. When the witnesses appeared, the questions on the cards were systematically asked. One question was read, and the card was turned over. Then the second question was read, and the third. I should say that 150 cards were in the sheaf. Every question contained implications about the impropriety of the presence of the United States in the Dominican Republic.

During the hearing, I complained about what was taking place. One of the questions asked was: "Did not Mr. X, of Y newspaper, make this statement?" The statement Mr. X made had challenged the presence of the United States in the Dominican Republic. I intervened and asked, "Is it not also true that another newspaperman during the Cuban episode, said that Castro was a Lincoln and a Robin Hood, devoted to the cause of the poor, robbing the rich, and turning his gains over to those who were in need?"

Certain newspapermen have said that we were improperly in Cuba and in the Dominican Republic. But our plight in Cuba, in my opinion, is the primary consequence of a misvaluation we made of Castro. Castro came to the United States and was given the dignity of appearing before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I deliberately did not attend that meeting. I could not dignify Castro's appearance before the Committee on Foreign Relations, having in my mind the knowledge of the circus trial that he had conducted.

Castro was a guest of the National Press Club. During the entire time he was here, the stories told about him were, in effect, that to Cuba had come a messiah gifted with charitable qualities; a friend of the free West; a friend of the United States. We took those stories as true. The result is the problem which now exists in Cuba.

I am firmly of the conviction that if the President had not acted as he did in April of this year, we now would have practically at our shores another Cuba. I cannot agree with the statements made by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] on the floor of the Senate on September 15. I do not believe that I am what may be called a hard realist; but I do not want to be labeled as a soft-minded idealist, one who is absolutely indifferent to realistic facts. I would feel myself to be a dupe if I daily believed what the Communists of the world are saying. The Communists have their techniques. They know how to operate subversively. They know how to foment riots. They are fomenting them in the United States. All that is needed is some small disorder followed by an invasion of well-equipped technicians who know how to exaggerate a situation; and before one knows it, mobs are in action. It was mobs that took charge of the Dominican Republic uprising.

I say to the people of my State that while I have agreed with many of the

things that have been recommended by the administration on this subject, I now stand foursquare behind what was done. I do so in the belief that it was serviceable as a security to our country and to the free world.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. First, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Ohio for the presentation he has made today. As a Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have watched, listened, and read with more than uncommon interest the discussions emanating from the other side of the aisle concerning the activities in which the United States was engaged in the Dominican Republic, and the criticisms and replies which have been made with respect to that action.

While I dislike to inject myself into what is pretty much a Democratic discussion, it does, after all, relate to hearings which were held in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I attended most of the hearings. They involved a rather searching analysis of what transpired in the early days of revolutionary activities in Santo Domingo and other parts of the Dominican Republic. I was curious about the nature of the hearings and the reasons for them, because, while I was in attendance for many hours, I heard no questions directed to the long series of witnesses as to what they felt our future policy should be or what they felt the solution ought to be, so far as the aftermath of the revolutionary period was concerned.

It all seemed to be a questioning in a somewhat critical search for knowledge as to why we got into the affair in the first place; whether we got in with the right number of people and at the right time; and whether the information that caused us to go in at all was accurate or inaccurate. The inquiry seemed to be principally a contest as to whether the writings of little men in the employ of big newspapers was correct so far as the situation in Santo Domingo was concerned; and whether the reports from the CIA, the State Department, and the OAS were accurate.

At the end of the hearings, I felt completely convinced, as did the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], that all the verities and all the facts seemed to be with the representatives of the Department of State and the American Government, rather than in the proclamations being made by the little men who were writing for big newspapers.

I concurred in and completely supported emphatically the action of President Johnson and the actions of the State Department, so far as their immediate reaction to the situation in the Dominican Republic was concerned. I believe they did the right thing in the right place at the right time with the right number of military personnel.

I am inclined to question a little some of the latter day activities of the Government so far as they relate to problems existing in the Dominican Republic. I dislike to see my Government connected

with a so-called kidnaping operation, in which one of the valiant fighters for freedom, Wessin y Wessin, was rather forcibly removed from the land of his origin and transferred to American soil.

As I understand the facts, he walked to the plane which took him out of the Dominican Republic. However, he walked reluctantly and involuntarily, and apparently with a bayonet which bore the imprimatur "made in the United States" at his back.

I dislike to see our Government injecting itself to that degree and in that manner in an activity which was certainly pleasing to the revolutionaries of the Dominican Republic and pleasing to the Communists. I am not a great advocate of Wessin y Wessin. I do not know how good a military leader he was. He would not be my candidate for President of the Dominican Republic if I were sitting at a political convention selecting nominees.

I should think that, slowly but surely, Uncle Sam would be learning that we do not make very many good guesses when we inject ourselves in that fashion and that forcefully into the internal affairs of another country. We should have learned something, I should think, from our experiences in Vietnam when we were permitting or promoting the ousting of Diem. We have never since then found a successor who seemed to have the capacity to develop the loyalty of his followers and fellow citizens that Diem possessed.

My skepticism is enhanced when I reflect that, with respect to Tshombe in the Congo, we spent much time, effort, and money in apparently kicking him out. Then, after we had created a vacuum, we spent much time, effort, and money in bringing him back. We were certainly wrong in either one instance or in the other so far as Tshombe in the Congo was concerned.

The Senator from Ohio pointed out that, in the situation in Cuba while we were making a transfer from Batista, who was bad, to Castro, who was worse, there was an apparent failure on the part of American officials generally to recognize that we were permitting or promoting there the control of Cuba by a Communist who had been trained in Communist training camps and who was completely dedicated to the Communist cause and subservient to the Russian Communist whiplash.

I am not at all sure that this administration is acting wisely or prudently or properly in conjunction with the Dominican Republic situation, since we took the initial action and since we put down the resolution and stabilized the situation. If, in fact, we are now to have a coalition government in Santo Domingo, we shall have failed to have secured the dividend which should have been available from the very wise and prudent and proper action which President Johnson originally took. I am not charging that we are going to do that. I am concerned about the way in which we moved in on Wessin y Wessin. It is a straw in the wind because of the indication that the little writers for the big newspapers are

having influence with people in big places in Washington.

I dislike to see that kind of indication. We should make sure that the people in the Dominican Republic have a democratically inclined, freedom-loving friend of freedom as their leader, and we should not dilute his capacity for success by making further concessions to the defeated Communist influences in that revolution.

Primarily I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Ohio has helped to set the record straight. He has related accurately what transpired in the Committee on Foreign Relations, in my opinion. I saw no evidence throughout the hearings to indicate that President Johnson had acted either inadvisedly or on inadequate information in making the decisions that he made in those early critical days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not want my statement to be construed as indicating approval or disapproval of what has recently happened. I have not had an opportunity to learn from the State Department what has taken place. However, I have apprehension about the removal of Wessin y Wessin. At this time, I should like to read some notes which I made when Bosch's government was overthrown several years ago. These are my notes concerning General Wessin y Wessin:

Wessin is about 33 years old. He was active in trying to drive the Trujillos and the Communists out of the army of the Dominican Republic. He wanted to raise the moral fabric of the army. He wrote an article pointing out the infiltration into the army of Communists. He is still the head of the Aviation School of the Military Division. He was a colonel and is now a general. He could have been the head of the government, but he declined.

These notes were written at the time of the Bosch overthrow. They wanted him to take the headship and he declined. To me that is testimony of great weight in showing the character of the man. Yet he is the one who was taken out of the Dominican Republic with a bayonet at his back and is now in Miami.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator gave that additional information concerning Wessin y Wessin.

As I say, I am not one of his advocates. I do not know enough about him. However, I do know that when a great many of the other military people were fleeing, he was fighting. He was standing up. He stepped into the critical breach, precisely as the U.S. Government stepped into the breach at a critical time, and together they set back the Communists.

I do not like to reward that kind of fighting for freedom by having my government associate itself with a movement to kidnap him and take him out of the country and send him to the United States against his will.

That is far different from saying that we should put him in high office. However, that kind of concession to the Communist groups who dislike him is a failure to show the kind of stamina and stature

now that was properly shown at the time the revolution began.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the notes which I made were based upon testimony given by Government witnesses—witnesses from the State Department primarily. I have these notes here. It can be readily seen that they are merely scribbled memorandums of what was said.

The Government stood firm last April. I do not know whether it is now beginning to yield to the attacks that are being made. I hope that it is not.

A coalition government which is friendly to the West will not survive. The Communists would take over in due time in the event a coalition government were established.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield about 13 minutes to me without losing his right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### SENATE DISCUSSION OF DOMINICAN SITUATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion about the situation in the Dominican Republic. The distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has, on the basis of an analysis of hearings held before his committee, made a speech in which he gave his views on the developments inherent in the early days preceding and following our involvement.

Senator FULBRIGHT was very careful to stress that the material on which he based his speech was testimony heard by the Foreign Relations Committee. Unfortunately, except for a 15-minute interval, I was unable to attend these hearings and, furthermore, I have not had the time to read the testimony, so I am unable to comment on the hearings.

There have been exceptions taken to as well as support of FULBRIGHT's remarks by various Members of the Senate. I think it should be pointed out that the chairman of the committee stated emphatically that what he said represented his own views, based on his understanding of the hearings.

As one who participated in the White House conferences on the subject of intervening in the Dominican Republic, I do not intend to say anything specific as to what went on at the meeting. But I feel that in view of the developments which have occurred over the past day or so, that it is appropriate to comment in general terms. When the difficulty occurred, the President did call the leadership and ranking members of certain committees to the White House to discuss what had happened and was happening in the Dominican Republic. He did state



that there were 5,000 nationals of foreign countries in Santo Domingo of whom 1,500 were Americans. He had received urgent requests and pleas from the chiefs of the various American agencies and I believe from some foreign embassies stating that the situation was extremely dangerous and he was told that if steps were not undertaken to insure the safety of these nationals that there could well be a substantial loss of life. There was no other country prepared or capable of giving the protection which was needed at the time except the United States. The President had to make a decision involving the safety of these nationals on the basis of the cables, telephone calls, and advice which he had received. When he announced his decision at the White House Conference there was no opposition raised at that time on the matter which was discussed in great detail.

The President, on the basis of his authority as Commander in Chief and his constitutional responsibility as President in the field of foreign policy, undertook to land military forces to protect these nationals. He selected a most capable man in the person of Lieutenant General Palmer to take command of the American Forces in Santo Domingo, and he laid the matter repeatedly before the OAS as an organization. Prior to that, he had brought it to the personal attention of as many Ambassadors of the American nations as could be contacted. He was desirous, at the earliest opportunity, of shelving the initial unilateral responsibility which the United States had undertaken and gave his wholehearted support to the creation of an Inter-American Police Force. He agreed, without hesitation, to a Brazilian becoming the overall commander of this force and the placing of General Palmer in a subordinate position under him. He dispatched various missions to try and bring the opposing groups together.

Finally, in the past 2 weeks, the OAS committee, which included Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker of the United States, was able to bring about a creation of an interim and provisional government under Hector Garcia Godoy. This interim government is to remain in power for 9 months. There is to be a 6-month period to try and bring some degree of stability to the Republic and in the last 3 months of the 9-month period, political campaigns are to be undertaken by means of which the Dominican people will be given the opportunity, it is hoped, to elect a government of their own choice.

All the obstacles have not been removed in the Dominican Republic, and I am of the opinion that in this uneasy though encouraging situation, there may yet be further trouble of one kind or another. However, I do think that significant progress has been made and I know that the President is very hopeful that it will be possible to reduce the OAS force still further as the Dominicans achieve a greater degree of stability. Certainly, it is his deepest desire that the situation will be ironed out so that the Dominicans themselves can assume, at the earliest moment, full control of their own affairs.

This has been a most difficult and delicate situation in which the President found himself and he has done his very best, on the basis of advice he has received, to bring the matter to a head. I feel that we owe him a debt of thanks for what he has been able to accomplish and to the OAS for what it has been able to bring about in a way of a reasonable agreement looking to a secure future for the Dominican people.

I would certainly underscore what the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has time and again said, that the President's decisions were fully understandable in the light of the circumstances as they were brought to his attention. I feel, also, that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was endeavoring to present to the Senate a thoughtful analysis of the views which he distilled from the hearings before his committee. An analysis of the circumstances surrounding major foreign policy decisions is of concern to the Senate and out of this can come constructive reactions from Senators which could well be useful in the field of foreign policy in the future. There has been some strenuous debate on the Dominican situation in this Chamber and there may well be more in the future.

In my opinion, the important thing at the moment is to recognize the fact that at long last, after a period of months, what looks like a lead to the solution has been worked out for the Dominican Republic and that solution was arrived at by the Organization of the American States in which we participated as a full member. A provisional government has been established. An interim President is in office. There has, according to available reports and to the best of my knowledge, been a general laying down of arms. The decision now is up to the Dominican people and the provisional government for the time being to adjust themselves to this situation to prepare for elections 9 months hence, and to establish a government based on the will of the people which can furnish and which can bring a degree of stability and economic prosperity to the Dominicans themselves. The United States has spent a large amount of money to aid in the rehabilitation of the Republic. It is prepared to continue to help if the Dominican people themselves take control of their own state and guide it to anchor in fairly calm political and economic waters. To that end the President has pledged his full support to the efforts of the OAS and I feel quite certain that the American people and their representatives in the Congress support him fully.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I completely commend the statement of the distinguished Senator from Montana. I do not see how the President could have done anything except intervene. I believe he showed firmness in his handling of foreign relations which should commend him to the entire Nation.

I wish to make an additional point: I know he had tried before intervention

to persuade the OAS to move. Apparently it moved too slowly. Since intervention, he has continued that effort. I am greatly heartened by the apparent activation, within OAS, of direct participation by many nations in the peace-keeping procedure, which for the first time, as I have observed that fine organization, indicates its willingness to come to grips with serious problems in various parts of the hemisphere.

I believe that from the leadership of the President, from his urging of the OAS, and from his taking unilateral leadership for a few days as the situation required, there will come a reactivation and rejuvenation of the OAS which will be of great importance to the entire hemisphere. His action will eventually commend itself to peace-loving people throughout the hemisphere as a wise act, because it brought about results so long desired, and only now about to be achieved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana has made a forthright and fair presentation of the situation as it prevailed in the Dominican Republic in April and as it prevails today.

I have had very little correspondence from those on either side of the situation. I have received only about 50 letters, some condemning the President for the action he took and others commending him. The letters indicated that the writers really were not in possession of the facts and did not know exactly what the situation was. I personally believe that the President was warranted in sending forces into the Dominican Republic on the night when the rebellion started.

I also believe, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has stated, that the President received some rather poor advice, that plenty of mistakes were made, and that it probably took much longer to restore order in the Dominican Republic than would have been necessary had certain mistakes not been made.

Now, however, the OAS has accomplished its purpose. It is providing for the setting up of a government to be established by the people of the Dominican Republic themselves, and I hope that we shall not undertake to interfere with the setting up of that government, unless it actually threatens the security of the United States, which I doubt it will do.

If I were a Communist from a foreign country, looking for a place in the Western Hemisphere to locate from where I could work with safety, I would never have chosen the Dominican Republic. I believe that to be about the worst place a Communist could find anywhere for his purposes. If I were looking, I believe there would be many cities in the United States which would be more likely places than the Dominican Republic was at the time of the rebellion.

However, I believe that if the people of that Republic desire to set up a government of their own which is progressive and forward-looking, even though it meets with the disapproval of certain interested parties, we should support them and work through the Organization of American States as far as we possibly can.

I believe that the situation now is such that we can safely conclude that the Dominican Republic is going to establish its own Government, and that it will be a government with which we can work, one which will improve the economy and the security of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont and the distinguished Senator from Florida for what they both had to say. I join them in expressing hope that the Organization of American States will become a stronger, more efficient, and more effective organization in the weeks, months, and years ahead.

The distinguished Senator from Vermont was at that fateful meeting in the White House when the President informed us of the situation then developing in the Dominican Republic. Because we are both bound by the executive nature of the meeting, we cannot say too much, but we were aware of what happened at the time, and we both gave our full endorsement to the policy undertaken in connection with the President's announcement to us in the Cabinet Room.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me express the hope I expressed for the Dominican Republic, that it will apply to all the Latin American countries in the Western Hemisphere. I do not believe that we should undertake to dictate to them just what kind of government they should live under, or whom they should have to head that government so long as it does not actually threaten the security of the United States.

I am still not convinced that what went on in the Dominican Republic in April threatened the security of the United States. It seemed to me that there would have been more bloodshed during that rebellion had the President not intervened. However, as I said before, I believe that he received some advice, as has been pointed out by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, which caused us to make more mistakes than we otherwise might have made, and which delayed plans for the establishment of a popular government in that country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to some extent the discussion relates to events in the past.

Now we are faced with the present.

It seems as though there is a good possibility—although nothing is sure in this world any more—of a reasonably good government coming out of the situation in the Dominican Republic.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for yielding to me, and if he will allow me just this once, to suggest the absence of a quorum, without his losing the right to

the floor, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9221) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16 and 31 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 10, 24, and 62 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10323) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1483. An act to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2042. An act to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended;

H.R. 948. An act to amend part II of the District of Columbia Code relating to divorce, legal separation, and annulment of marriage in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5883. An act to amend the bonding provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act;

H.R. 10014. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1954, relating to office space in the districts of Members of the House of Representatives, and the act of June 27, 1956, relating to office space in the States of Senators; and

H.R. 10874. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to eliminate certain provisions which reduce spouses' annuities, to provide coverage for tips, to increase the base on which railroad retirement benefits and taxes are computed, and to change the railroad retirement tax rates.

#### AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2580) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the bill we are considering today accomplishes major reforms in our immigration policy. This bill is not concerned with increasing immigration to this country, nor will it lower any of the high standards we apply in selection of immigrants. The basic change it makes is the elimination of the national origins quota system, in line with the recommendations of the last four Presidents of the United States, and Members of Congress from both parties.

For 41 years, the immigration policy of our country has been crippled by this system. Because of it we have never been able to achieve the annual quota use authorized by law. We have discriminated in favor of some people over others, contrary to our basic principles as a nation, simply on the basis of birth. We have separated families needlessly. We have been forced to forgo the talents of many professionals whose skills were needed to cure, to teach and to enhance the lives of Americans.

The present law has caused thousands of instances of personal hardship, of which every Senator is aware. Several times Congress has tried to correct the twisted results of the national origins system through emergency legislation. Six times between 1948 and 1962 laws were passed for the admission of refugees. Four times between 1957 and 1962 we have made special provisions for relatives of American citizens or orphans. In addition, each year we are called upon to consider thousands of private bills to accommodate persons caught in the backwash of this origins system.

These efforts at circumvention are further proof that the national origins system is in disrepute. We cannot continue to respect a law we constantly seek to circumvent. To continue with such a law brings discredit upon ourselves as legislators. The national origins system has even failed in the purpose for which it was intended: to keep the ethnic balance of our country forever as it was in 1920. In 1920, 79 percent of our white population was of northern and western European origin. During the first 30 years of the national origins system, only 39 percent of our total immigration came from such areas. Since 1952, some 3.5 million persons have been admitted to this country as immigrants. Two-thirds of them came outside the national origins quota. Since 1952, we have authorized 2.1 million national origins quota numbers. Only one-half of these numbers were used.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statistical summary of immigrants admitted from June 30, 1953, through June 30, 1964.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.



## Immigrants admitted to the United States, by classes under the immigration laws, years ended June 30, 1953-64

Class	1953-64	1953 <sup>1</sup>	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964
Total immigrants admitted	3,197,857	170,434	208,177	237,790	321,625	326,867	253,265	260,686	265,398	271,344	283,763	306,260	292,248
Quota immigrants (total)	1,140,479	84,175	94,098	82,232	89,310	97,178	102,153	97,657	101,373	96,104	90,319	103,036	102,844
Immigration and Nationality Act	1,124,863	78,053	88,016	79,617	88,825	97,084	102,077	97,651	101,352	96,074	90,305	102,995	102,814
1st preference quota:													
Selected immigrants of special skill or ability	30,600	77	1,429	1,776	1,946	2,992	3,941	3,518	3,385	3,460	3,313	2,288	2,475
Their spouses and children	28,676	45	1,027	1,236	1,420	2,739	3,197	3,109	3,681	3,758	3,721	2,374	2,387
Skilled agriculturists, their wives and children (1924 act)	321	321											
Parents or husbands of U.S. citizens (1924 act)	4,290	4,290											
2d preference quota:													
Parents of U.S. citizens	35,847	983	2,783	2,394	2,843	3,677	2,608	3,406	3,451	3,381	2,252	4,006	4,063
Unmarried sons or daughters of U.S. citizens <sup>2</sup>	2,409								376	931	341	392	369
Wives and children of resident aliens (1924 act)	4,133	4,133											
3d preference quota:													
Spouses of resident aliens	28,450	291	3,180	2,604	2,902	2,848	2,719	3,409	2,767	2,132	1,786	1,832	1,980
Unmarried sons or daughters of resident aliens <sup>2</sup>	36,618	220	2,824	2,821	4,064	3,783	2,668	4,134	3,225	3,265	2,419	3,266	3,929
4th preference quota:													
Brothers or sisters of U.S. citizens	22,406	63	1,556	1,955	1,690	1,715	2,903	2,162	1,956	2,346	2,162	2,187	1,711
Married sons or daughters of U.S. citizens <sup>2</sup>	7,928	22	374	1,120	431	1,443	2,029	1,275	425	244	205	199	161
Spouses and children of brothers or sisters, sons or daughters of U.S. citizens <sup>4</sup>	11,580								1,044	2,572	2,548	2,887	2,529
Adopted sons or daughters of U.S. citizens <sup>2</sup>	137								55	62	16	1	3
Nonpreference quota	911,468	67,608	74,843	65,711	73,529	77,887	82,030	76,638	80,987	73,923	71,542	83,563	83,207
Special legislation (quota immigrants)	15,616	6,122	6,082	2,615	485	94	76	6	21	30	14	41	30
Displaced persons (Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (quota))	15,121	5,759	6,082	2,615	485	94	76	6			3	1	
Skilled sheepherders (act of Apr. 9, 1952 (quota))	363	363											
Foreign government officials adjusted under sec. 13, (act of Sept. 11, 1957 (quota))	132								21	30	11	40	30
Nonquota immigrants (total)	2,057,378	86,259	114,079	155,558	232,315	229,689	151,112	163,029	164,025	175,240	193,444	203,224	189,404
Immigration and Nationality Act	1,681,285	85,015	112,854	126,135	156,808	147,243	125,591	111,341	133,087	152,382	169,346	183,283	178,200
Wives of U.S. citizens	236,980	15,916	17,145	18,504	21,244	21,794	23,517	22,620	21,621	20,012	17,316	17,590	19,701
Husbands of U.S. citizens	73,418	3,359	7,725	6,716	5,788	5,767	5,833	6,913	6,140	6,059	6,046	6,035	6,457
Children of U.S. citizens	70,896	3,268	5,819	5,662	4,710	4,798	5,970	6,809	6,454	6,480	6,354	6,981	7,531
Natives of Western Hemisphere countries	1,227,778	58,985	78,897	92,620	122,083	111,344	86,528	66,386	89,566	110,140	130,741	144,677	135,816
Their spouses and children	27,482	2,114	1,629	1,654	1,949	2,144	2,052	1,810	2,135	2,696	2,764	3,067	3,468
Persons who had been U.S. citizens	902	104	427	87	44	58	43	22	36	15	25	23	18
Ministers of religious denominations, their spouses and children	5,107	387	385	307	350	403	435	558	485	406	451	462	478
Employees of U.S. Government abroad, their spouses and children	205	2	4	9	2	8	23	24	27	10	3	32	61
Children born abroad to resident aliens or subsequent to issuance of visa	12,117	326	358	348	412	701	926	1,228	1,458	1,411	1,495	1,611	1,843
Aliens adjusted under sec. 249, Immigration and Nationality Act <sup>4</sup>	22,795							4,321	4,773	5,037	3,399	2,680	2,585
Other nonquota immigrants	3,605	* 554	465	228	226	226	269	590	392	116	152	125	262
Special legislation (nonquota immigrants)	376,093	1,244	1,225	29,423	75,507	82,446	25,521	51,688	30,938	22,858	24,098	19,941	11,204
Displaced persons (Displaced Persons Act of 1948 (nonquota))	1,030	1,030											
Orphans (act of July 29, 1953)	465		399	67									
Refugees (Refugee Relief Act of 1953)	189,021		821	29,002	75,473	82,444	1,012	198	43	9	15	3	1
Skilled sheepherders (act of Sept. 3, 1954 (non-quota))	385			354	31								
Immigrants (act of Sept. 11, 1957)	61,948						24,467	24,834	6,612	3,982	1,809	213	31
Hungarian parolees (act of July 25, 1958)	30,701							25,424	5,067	122	51	20	17
Azores and Netherlands refugees (act of Sept. 2, 1958)	22,213							1,187	8,870	5,472	4,796	1,888	
Immigrants (secs. 4 and 6, act of Sept. 22, 1959)	29,337							10,314	13,255	11,912	2,848	765	
Immigrants (act of Sept. 26, 1961)	15,525												
Other nonquota immigrants (special legislation)	412	214	5		3	2	42	45	32	18	27	12	12
Refugee and escapees (act of July 14, 1960)	6,111											2,005	4,106
Immigrants (act of Oct. 24, 1962)	18,944											12,672	6,272

<sup>1</sup> In 1953 figures include admissions under Immigration Act of 1924.<sup>2</sup> Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, all sons or daughters of U.S. citizens over 21 years of age were classified as 4th preference quota under the Immigration and Nationality Act. Adopted sons and daughters with petitions approved prior to Sept. 22, 1959, remained 4th preference.<sup>3</sup> Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, included only children under 21 of resident aliens. Adult sons or daughters of resident aliens were classified as nonpreference quota.<sup>4</sup> Prior to act of Sept. 22, 1959, classified as nonpreference quota.<sup>5</sup> Not reported prior to 1959.<sup>6</sup> Includes 321 professors of colleges and universities, their wives and children.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, from these figures, it was obvious to the Judiciary Committee that the current system is as much a failure as a device as it is an embarrassment as a doctrine. The bill now before the Senate abolishes it altogether.

The new policy in the bill before us was developed under the administration of President Kennedy by experts both in Congress and the executive branch. Extensive hearings were held, both last year and this, in the Senate and the House. The Senate Immigration Subcommittee has sat regularly since last February. We have heard over 50 witnesses. I can report, Mr. President, that opposition to this measure is minimal. Many of the private organizations who differed with us in the past now agree

the national origins system must be eliminated.

The current bill phases out the national origins system over a 3-year period. Beginning July 1, 1963, our immigration policy will be based on the concept of "first come, first served." We no longer will ask a man where he was born. Instead we will ask if he seeks to join his family, or if he can help meet the economic and social needs of the Nation. Favoritism based on nationality will disappear. Favoritism based on individual worth and qualifications will take its place.

When this system is fully in effect, 170,000 quota numbers will be available to the world, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere. Parents, spouses, and children of U.S. citizens will be considered as

"immediate relatives" and, as such, will be under no numerical limitation at all. Due to the existence of backlogs of applicants in those nations discriminated against by the national origins system, an annual limitation per country of 20,000 quota immigrants is established, so that in the short run no one nation will be able to receive an unduly disproportionate share of the quota numbers. It is anticipated that after 3 years, these backlogs of intending immigrants will be eliminated in all instances but for one category of Italians, and that situation will be rectified shortly thereafter.

The total number of authorized quotas is not increased substantially by this bill. Currently, we authorize the use of 158,561 numbers per year, but this is exclusive of refugees. Under the new

law, provision is made for the acceptance of some 10,200 refugees. This is what accounts for the increase in total numbers under this bill from 158,561 to 170,000.

Under our new "first come, first served" system, while all immigrants will be in worldwide competition, we will retain certain preferences and, of course, our traditional stringent safeguards. The preferences under this bill reflect our strong humanitarian belief in family unity as well as personal merit. The 170,000 numbers will be made available in the following order of preference:

First, 20 percent, or 34,000 quota numbers, to unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens;

Second, 20 percent, or 34,000 quota numbers, to the spouses and unmarried children of permanent resident aliens;

Third, 10 percent, or 17,000 quota numbers, will be available to persons who can qualify as professionals or people of ability in the arts or sciences who will substantially benefit the United States;

Fourth, 10 percent, or 17,000 numbers, to the married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens;

Fifth, 24 percent, or 40,800 numbers, to the brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens;

Sixth, 10 percent, or 17,000 numbers, to qualified persons capable of performing permanent labor for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exists in the United States;

Seventh, 6 percent, or 10,200 numbers, for refugees as defined in the bill. In any given year, one-half of these numbers may be used to adjust the status of previously paroled refugees who can qualify as permanent resident aliens.

The numbers stated in these preference categories are fixed for the professionals, the laborers, and the refugees. Any other preference category dealing with family relationships receives the unused quota numbers of the preference category before it. Finally, all numbers unused in all the preference categories flow in the end for the use of nonpreference or "new seed" immigrants.

Mr. President, the foregoing is a general description of our immigration policy on July 1, 1968. On that date no nation will have a quota number assigned to it—except for the equalizing limit of 20,000 per nation—and no immigrant will be penalized by his birth or ancestry. Between now and then, we have adopted a simple and equitable phasing-out system. For the 3 years beginning July 1, 1965, each nation will maintain its national origin quota, but the quota numbers unused by any nation will be placed in an immigration pool for redistribution to other nations the following year. We will start the pool out with the 55,600 numbers unused last year. During the 3 years certain parts of the new system will be in effect; no one nation can receive more than 20,000 numbers per year. The immigration pool will be available only to immigrants qualifying under the new preference system. The total number available to the world will be the new total of 170,000. Because refugees are

included in our general immigration law for the first time, both the Senate and House committee intended that the 6 percent of our total immigration numbers, allocated to refugees, or 10,200, will be available for use from the pool during the phaseout years. Refugees were never under the national origin system and should not be now: thus the numbers available for this purpose will be present both before and after July 1, 1968.

Mr. President, in addition to eliminating the national origins system, this bill makes other reforms in our immigration policy that support the principles of merit and of first come, first served. I am especially gratified that we are wiping out the Asia-Pacific triangle. Established by the McCarran-Walter Act of 1952, this geographic triangle is used to identify those nations of the East to which a specially discriminatory rule applies. Any person, regardless of his place of birth, whose ancestry can be traced to a nation or nations within the triangle is chargeable to the quota of that nation, or to a general triangle quota of 100. The elimination of this crude device means that finally, after almost 100 years, Asian peoples are no longer discriminated against in the immigration laws of our country.

The plight of refugees has been of special concern to us since the end of World War II. Every outbreak of violence between nations leaves its toll in the homeless and dispossessed. Our concern for refugees was capped in 1960 by the passage of the fair share law, under which we agreed to accept up to 25 percent of persons displaced to other lands in a prior 6-month period, if these persons fell under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. This law was passed in keeping with World Refugee Year. By placing refugees under our general immigration law for the first time, the bill before us will do away with the main provisions of the fair share law, thus allowing the United States to make its own determination of who is or is not a refugee.

As defined in this bill, refugees are those persons displaced from Communist-dominated countries or areas, or from any country in the defined area of the Middle East because of persecution, or fear of persecution, on account of race, religion, or political opinion. They must be currently settled in countries other than their homelands.

The bill also will make quota numbers available to refugees displaced by natural calamities, as defined by the President. This provision is designed to assure the world that we will remain a haven for the displaced. It means that when situations arise, like the earthquakes in the Azores in 1963, and floods in southeastern Europe, we will be able to assure that the cases of greatest need can be processed at once, while special legislation is being considered.

Another change brought about by this bill relates to the controls exercised by the Secretary of Labor to protect our economy from whatever harsh effects immigration could create. Under cur-

rent law, aliens who enter to seek employment are excluded from the country only if the Secretary of Labor has determined that their presence would have an adverse effect on the employment or the wages and working conditions of American citizens. Under this procedure, the Secretary certifies that aliens falling under certain occupational or skill definitions should be excluded because they will threaten domestic employment. The new bill reverses this procedure. It places the burden of proving no adverse effect on the applying alien. The intending immigrant must receive a certificate from the Secretary of Labor that his presence will not affect U.S. employment, wages, or working conditions.

Mr. President, this provision was included in this bill to further protect our labor force during periods of high unemployment. But it was included with the intent that it be meaningful only where it has some meaning. Section 212(a)14 of the act which is amended here relates only to those aliens who come here for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor. Hence one would not expect a nonpreference housewife to be forced to seek a specific case clearance from the Secretary.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is talking about aliens who come here seeking to stay permanently under the immigration laws and not aliens who come here for seasonal employment as temporary supplemental agricultural workers?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Moreover, Mr. President, it was not our intention, nor that of the AFL-CIO, that all intending immigrants must undergo an employment analysis of great detail that could be time consuming and disruptive to the normal flow of immigration. We know that the Department of Labor maintains statistics on occupations, skills, and labor in short supply in this country. Naturally, then, any applicant for admission who falls within the categories should not have to wait for a detailed study by the Labor Department before his certificate is issued. On the other hand, there will be cases where the Secretary will be expected to ascertain in some detail the need for the immigrant in this country under the provisions of the law. In any event we would expect the Secretary of Labor to devise workable rules and regulations by which he could carry out his responsibilities under the law without unduly interrupting or delaying immigration to this country. The function of the Secretary is to increase the quality of immigration, not to diminish it below levels authorized by law.

The final major change brought about by this legislation affects the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The bill will modify the current nonquota status of these nations by placing a ceiling of 120,000 on the entire hemisphere, exclusive of parents, spouses, and children. This ceiling, effective July 1, 1968, will place no numerical limit on any one



country, however, nor will it incorporate the preference system in force for the rest of the world.

The bill also creates a Select Commission on Western Hemisphere Immigration. This Commission will conduct a complete study of the demographic, economic, and social changes underway in this hemisphere and draw conclusions pertinent to our immigration policy. The Commission will make its first report to the President and the Congress by July 1, 1967, and its final report by January 15, 1968.

Mr. President, there are other amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act in this important bill. Some are of a technical nature, causing the law to conform to the basic change in our policy; others are more substantive. For example, the newly independent nations of Jamaica and Trinidad-Tobago are included within the definition of the Western Hemisphere by a change in the definition of the Western Hemisphere to include any independent foreign country in this hemisphere. This broad definition, rather than the current restrictive one, will also encompass areas that might gain their independence in the future.

Also, with regard to this hemisphere, current law does not allow for the adjustment of status of aliens who arrive as nonimmigrants from the nations contiguous to the United States or the adjacent islands. In the light of some abuses, whereby Western Hemisphere persons have come as visitors and then sought an adjustment to permanent residents, the current restriction on adjustment was extended to cover the entire hemisphere. An important exception has been made in the Senate committee, however, to provide for those who have fled, or will flee in the future, from a hemisphere nation to escape persecution because of race, religion, or political opinion. This was devised to ease the situation of many Cubans who have entered the United States in recent years.

In general, the various exclusions that exist in our current law have been retained. This bill does, however, recognize the advances made in the treatment and control of epilepsy, and removes persons so afflicted from the exclusions of the law.

In addition, those who are classified as mentally retarded, and those who have suffered past mental afflictions will be treated in the same manner as we currently treat those who are classified as tubercular. That is, the conditions and controls for the admission of such people will rest with the Attorney General. He shall establish the regulations for admission in consultation with the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Section 8(c) of the bill is a consolidation of the definition of "eligible orphan" from different sections of the current law. It was meant to merely restate the definition while in no way changing it from current usage.

Finally, alien crewmen who entered illegally will no longer be treated dif-

ferently than other illegal entrants when seeking an adjustment of status.

This is the bill before the Senate. It was drafted in the belief that, in drafting an immigration law, Congress should provide our country with a source of strength, not a source of problems. We should be responsive to human needs, but mindful of economic realities. We should not add to the difficulties our country is having, but rather try to aid in the solution of these difficulties. I believe that a fair reading of this bill will show that these responsibilities are discharged.

There have been, however, certain questions raised in the course of our hearings that indicated certain fears or concerns in the minds of some interested people. I would like to set them straight.

First was the fear that this legislation would result in a significant increase in overall immigration. As I have previously stated, the number of quotas authorized each year will not be substantially increased. The world total—exclusive of Western Hemisphere—will be 170,000, an increase of approximately 11,500 over current authorization. But 10,200 of that increase is accounted for by the inclusion of refugees in our general law for the first time.

There will be some increase in total immigration to the United States—about 50,000 to 60,000 per year. This results from changing the law from an individual country quota system to a worldwide system. These are the numbers that go unused each year because quota numbers given to a country that are not utilized are wasted. By removing that obstacle to use, all numbers authorized will now be used, thus the increase in immigration will be about the same as the number of quotas now wasted. More specifically, the future use of numbers can be estimated as follows. Under this bill, we will use the 170,000 numbers given to the world, exclusive of the Western Hemisphere, and about 60,000 more for immediate relatives. Over the past 10 years we have averaged 110,000 per year from the Western Hemisphere. This should continue, along with approximately 15,000 immediate relatives. Thus we will admit an estimated total of 355,000. This is but a 60,000 increase in total immigration over our average total for the last decade.

We are talking about 60,000 people, in a population nearing 200 million, that is growing, without immigration, at a rate of 3 million per year. The percentage increase that immigration will represent is infinitesimally small. This legislation opens no "floodgate." Rather it admits about the same number of immigrants that current law would allow, but for the national origins restriction.

Another fear is that immigrants from nations other than those in northern Europe will not assimilate into our society. The difficulty with this argument is that it comes 40 years too late. Hundreds of thousands of such immigrants have come here in recent years, and their adjustment has been notable. At my request, many voluntary agencies that as-

sist new immigrants conducted lengthy surveys covering people who have arrived since the late 1940's. The results would be most gratifying to any American. I have only found five cases of criminal complaints involving immigrants in our studies of many thousands. Unemployment rates among these people are much lower than the national average; business ownership between 10 percent and 15 percent higher; home ownership as high as 80 percent in one city and averaging about 30 percent elsewhere. Economic self-sufficiency after approximately 4½ months from the date of arrival. By every standard of assimilation these immigrants have adjusted faster than any previous group.

In whatever other definition we wish to give to assimilate, we would find our new residents doing well. Family stability is found to be excellent; cases of immigrants on public welfare are difficult to find; 85 to 95 percent of those eligible have become naturalized citizens, and so forth.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the people who comprise the new immigration—the type which this bill would give preference to—are relatively well educated and well to do. They are familiar with American ways. They share our ideals. Our merchandise, our styles, our patterns of living are an integral part of their own countries. Many of them learn English as a second language in their schools. In an age of global television and the universality of American culture, their assimilation, in a real sense, begins before they come here.

Finally, the fear is raised that under this bill immigrants will be taking jobs away from Americans at a time we find it difficult to lower our unemployment rate below 4 percent. Mr. President, I have already described the more stringent controls that this bill gives to the Secretary of Labor to insure against any adverse effects of immigration on American labor. I would also point out that this measure has the complete support of the AFL-CIO; support that would not be forthcoming if the fear of job loss for Americans were real.

The fact is that most immigrants do not enter the labor market at all—they are consumers and create demands for additional labor. Since 1947, only 47 percent of our total immigration entered the labor force, while 53 percent became consumers only, providing a net increase in the demand for goods and services. Of our total immigrant work force since 1947, approximately one-third entered professional and technical occupations—a ratio higher than that for our own domestic labor force. Last year alone, some 20,000 immigrants entered jobs defined as critical occupations by the Selective Service System. These are the people whose creativity makes more jobs, not fewer. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two tables summarizing occupational distribution of recent immigration, which bear this out.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record.

TABLE 1.—Number and percent distribution of immigrants by broad occupational groups, for fiscal years 1947-64 and for selected years

Occupational groups	Total, 1947 through 1964		1964		1954		1947	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total admitted.....	4,424,460	100.0	292,248	100.0	208,177	100.0	147,292	100.0
With occupation.....	2,077,594	47.0	131,098	44.9	96,110	46.2	65,583	44.5
No occupation.....	2,346,866	53.0	151,076	51.7	112,067	53.8	81,709	55.5
No occupation reported.....	(1)		10,074	3.4	(1)		(1)	
With occupation <sup>2</sup> .....	2,077,594	100.0	131,098	100.0	96,110	100.0	65,583	100.0
Professional, technical and kindred workers.....	343,414	16.5	28,756	21.9	13,817	14.4	10,891	16.6
Farmers and farm managers.....	92,180	4.4	1,732	1.3	3,846	4.0	3,462	5.3
Managers, officials and proprietors, except farm.....	101,708	4.9	6,822	5.2	5,296	5.5	5,886	9.0
Clerical, sales, and kindred workers.....	367,845	17.7	30,015	22.9	16,018	16.7	13,691	21.3
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers.....	321,453	15.5	17,568	13.4	15,396	16.0	8,726	13.3
Operatives and kindred workers.....	279,646	13.5	14,243	10.9	16,755	17.4	10,580	16.1
Private household workers.....	157,306	7.6	8,451	6.4	8,096	8.4	4,922	7.5
Service workers, except private household.....	125,053	6.0	10,396	7.9	5,203	5.4	3,882	5.9
Farm laborers and foremen.....	78,044	3.8	3,988	3.0	1,622	1.7	442	.7
Laborers, except farm and mine.....	210,945	10.2	9,127	7.0	10,061	10.5	2,831	4.3

<sup>1</sup> "No occupation" includes "no occupation reported" group.<sup>2</sup> Includes immigrants 14 years of age and over.

NOTE.—Detail may not add to totals due to rounding.

Source: Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

TABLE 2.—Number of immigrants in selected critical occupations admitted each year, fiscal years 1954-64<sup>1</sup>

	Total, 1954-64	1964	1963	1962	1961	1960	1959	1958	1957	1956	1955	1954
Biological scientists.....	601	112	81	49	48	53	57	56	51	35	36	23
Chemists.....	6,335	825	814	474	551	504	645	626	668	494	351	383
Dentists.....	1,429	160	177	115	119	110	99	129	132	159	113	116
Engineers.....	36,461	3,660	3,966	2,909	2,868	3,338	3,936	4,008	4,524	2,794	2,067	2,391
Geologists and geophysicists.....	659	85	73	88	66	42	59	58	62	51	41	34
Mathematicians.....	345	50	56	39	24	31	29	32	35	17	18	14
Nurses.....	36,858	4,230	4,355	3,700	3,449	3,828	3,620	3,729	3,517	3,064	1,864	1,502
Physicians and surgeons.....	18,424	2,249	2,093	1,797	1,683	1,574	1,630	1,934	1,990	1,388	1,046	1,040
Physicists.....	1,610	242	216	187	151	162	155	145	128	75	75	74
Professors and instructors.....	4,767	839	761	589	500	367	340	352	372	290	173	184
Teachers not specified.....	27,218	4,086	3,727	3,182	2,686	2,532	2,670	2,471	2,304	655	1,549	1,356
Technicians.....	17,209	2,448	2,197	1,838	1,635	1,632	1,821	1,346	1,553	1,095	840	804
Machinists.....	10,252	969	897	681	819	993	1,476	836	1,393	1,106	594	488
Toolmakers, diemakers, and setters.....	7,334	423	473	369	460	706	654	858	1,150	894	587	760

<sup>1</sup> The occupational categories listed in this table are those which immigrants reported on their arrival in the United States. It was not possible, in a few instances, because of lack of sufficient occupational detail to make a precise match with the occupations which appear on the list of currently critical occupations as determined by the Technical Committee on Critical Occupations of the U.S. Department of Labor. For this reason, totals are not shown.

Source: 1959 through 1964, annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice; 1954 through 1958, data furnished by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In effect then, immigration benefits our economy and labor force, as long as it is selective and controlled. This bill will allow greater selectivity and greater control.

Mr. President, what we are about to consider is the fruit of the efforts of many people over many years: voluntary organizations, who year after year raised their voices against the hardship of the quota system; members of the other body, such as Representative CLEGG of New York and Representative FEIGHAN of Ohio, who have vigorously pursued reform; and many others. May I say that my efforts on this subject have been brief in comparison with theirs. If this is a historic occasion, if we are about to take a long awaited step, there are many Senators, here now and with us in the past, whose efforts made them far more worthy of the honor of guiding this bill to passage than those of the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

I think of the late senior Senator from New York, Herbert Lehman, who introduced the first bill to repeal the national origins quota system after the report of President Truman's Commission in 1953.

I think of our distinguished Vice President, who cosponsored such a bill in each Congress, and spoke for it around the country.

I think of President Kennedy, who as a Senator sponsored much of the legislation that breached the quota system to unify families and who first proposed the principles of this bill in 1963. I thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who has introduced his own bills in the past, as well as this bill on behalf of the administration.

And I think of all their colleagues who joined with them, year after year, to make this fight. Without their efforts we would not have this opportunity.

Mr. President, George Washington prescribed an immigration policy almost 200 years ago saying:

The bosom of America is open to receive not only the opulent and respectable stranger but the oppressed and persecuted of all nations and religions; whom we shall welcome to a participation of all our rights and privileges, if by decency and propriety of conduct they appear to merit the enjoyment.

This bill is in keeping with the wish of our first President, and with the wiser strains of our immigration policy that run through most of our history. After 40 years we have returned to first principles. Immigration, more than anything else, has supplied America with the human strength that is the core of its greatness. Let us keep the strength renewing.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The presentation just made by my able friend from Massachusetts is excellent. He need not apologize for the manner in which he will guide the proposed legislation successfully through the Senate.

I recall that when the Senator's late illustrious brother occupied the White House, he made recommendations to the Senate in this field, and I supported him. I recall that when President Kennedy's predecessor, General Eisenhower, was our Chief Executive and made recommendations in this field, I supported him.

Years ago, legislation tending toward what the able junior Senator from Massachusetts has now presented was passed by the Senate, only to suffer an unkind fate in the House.

In my judgment, the junior Senator from Massachusetts and other members of the Committee on the Judiciary have reported a bill of which all of us may be proud.

Specifically, is it not true that the manner in which the bill applies to the problem of refugees is simply and solely a continuation of the policy first established in the administration of President Eisenhower, carried forward in the administration of the late President Kennedy, and now recognized for the first



time, as the able Senator from Massachusetts has said, in the bill to provide for the amendment of the Immigration Act, which he has presented to us?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator from California is correct. As he has stated, the bill includes a provision specifically for the consideration of the refugee problem. This is the first time that refugee provisions have been placed in our permanent immigration law.

The bill contains a definition of the refugees that we will accept, of how they will be admitted, and from what particular parts of the world they may come.

I refer the Senator from California to page 35 of the bill, which establishes quite clearly what we mean by refugees—those fleeing from Communist domination, from the effects of natural calamity, or from the defined areas in the Middle East.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator. I shall watch the debate closely.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Before I take the floor in my own right, as I shall do in a few moments, I take occasion to pay tribute to the floor manager of the bill, the able junior Senator from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The late President Kennedy was deeply interested in this field, and many of the provisions of the bill represent a realization of a dream entertained by him. So it is quite fitting that the bill should be guided to passage through the Senate by his able brother.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts presided over the hearings of the subcommittee which began last February and continued until comparatively recent days. Throughout that time, he always presided with courtesy, with tact, with an understanding of the problems involved, and with an eloquent presentation of his own views on the subject.

I pay tribute also at this time to the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], who is now presiding over the Senate, and who introduced the bill which formed, in large measure, the blueprint for the consideration of the committee and has culminated in the reporting of the bill now before the Senate.

In paying tribute, I should also say that the subcommittee labored hard on this subject. High commendation is due to the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] for his interest, efforts, and untiring devotion to the work of the subcommittee. His amendments considerably improved the bill.

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], who is not a member of the subcommittee, but is of the full committee, deserve much credit for the work which has resulted in the presentation of the bill to the Senate today.

I compliment the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts for his elo-

quent presentation and his excellent analysis of the bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from North Carolina. More than anyone else, he was in constant attendance at the committee hearings, and labored long and hard in bringing this measure to the floor today. To a great extent, his exhaustive probing, questioning, and analyzing brought many worthwhile recommendations for the improvement of the bill. So I appreciate particularly the kind comments of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. President, I desire to mention one additional matter. The distinguished junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is absent from the Senate at this time on official business, brought to my attention certain language that appears in the third paragraph on page 26 of the report, pointing out to me that this was not the language that was agreed to by the committee. With his point of view, I thoroughly concurred. Let me now read the language about which the Senator from Florida expressed concern:

The attention of the committee was directed to the situation which exists with reference to the practices and procedures controlling the importation of aliens to perform temporary services under section 214(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, both as it relates to the importation of actors and other performers and as it relates to other types of employment.

Further, there appears in the report the following language in the last sentence of the same paragraph:

The Attorney General will be requested to study this matter of consultation with the Secretary of Labor in those cases involving the importation of nonimmigrant aliens under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) and (ii) and report seasonably to the committee the results of his study.

The Senators from Florida expressed concern that the words "and as it relates to other types of employment" which appear in the first sentence of the third paragraph and the words referring to section 101(a)(15)(H) in the last sentence of the same paragraph was not the language approved by the committee, and could conceivably include nonimmigrant farm labor which the committee had no intention of including in the report.

I informed the junior Senator from Florida that it was the intention of the committee that the language in the report refer solely to the importation of actors and performers of exceptional ability and related employees in the entertainment field, such as theatrical technicians, electricians, wardrobe personnel and so forth.

There is a clear understanding between myself, the junior Senator from Florida, and other members of the committee with respect to this language that the committee had no intention of including nonimmigrant farm labor in the language agreed to.

I regret that this language is in such a form that it could be misconstrued and want to say very definitely now that

the committee makes no change or reference to nonimmigrant farm labor either in the report or the bill before us. As a matter of fact this was made clear in the committee in connection with the colloquy that was had between the junior Senator from Florida, myself, and other members of the committee.

The language that I have referred to was added to cover those temporary workers who accompany theatrical performers to assist them in their performances and again was not included to refer to nonimmigrant farm labor.

Let me make it abundantly clear that no change is made in existing law with respect to nonimmigrant farm labor and that the language in the report was meant to be confined as I have previously stated to the importation of actors and other performers of exceptional ability and related employees in the entertainment field. I can assure the members of the Senate that had this report not been printed that most certainly the words in the first sentence of the third paragraph on page 26 and those words in the last sentence referring to section 101(a)(15)(H) would be deleted from the report, so that there could be no possible misconstruance.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for making so clear the point which has just been clarified relative to the inclusion of certain unfortunate wording in the committee report.

The Senator will recall, as will other Senators, that the Senate recently had a rather sturdy debate on this question relating to the importation of temporary workers for agricultural labor from foreign nations, which workers are not admitted as applicants for permanent residence.

In that debate the Senate was evenly divided, as the Senator will recall. The controlling vote was cast by the distinguished Vice President, which made a total vote, as I recall, of 46 to 45. Shortly after that action, and after the amendment sponsored by the senior Senator from Florida and by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], had been omitted from the farm bill then pending, by the vote of the Vice President, we had heard that there would be included in the immigration bill a provision relating to the same subject and applying in a different way, of course, from that which was pursued by our amendment.

The senior Senator from Florida inquired at once of the committee and the committee staff and found that, just as his friend has now stated, no such provision was included in the bill. It had been agreed in the committee that the bill should make no reference to nonimmigrant farm labor. It had also been agreed in the committee that there should be no reference to the subject matter in the report. However, when the report was available, immediate anx-

iety was created in certain agricultural circles by the wording to which the Senator has referred.

The senior Senator from Florida at once took up this matter, first with his distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Florida, and later with the chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. EASTLAND], with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and with other members of the committee, and found that the wording of the report, if it applied to agricultural labor, was unfortunate because it had not been approved by the committee.

Later we found that was exactly the understanding of my distinguished friend who has so ably explained the provisions of this bill, the junior Senator from Massachusetts.

I appreciate the fact that he has cleared up this matter so thoroughly by his statement.

As I now understand it, there is no reference in the bill itself to the subject matter of supplemental agricultural labor from foreign countries coming to this country to help harvest or to help produce our crops, and there is no reference contained in the report. The words quoted by the distinguished Senator from the report were meant to relate and do relate solely to actors and persons in the entertainment field and technicians and specialists who accompany them when they come to this country. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct in his understanding. This legislation before us is a very important, but limited, adjustment to the McCarran-Walter Act. This bill takes a particular part of existing law, as I mentioned in my speech, relating to immigration factors such as the national origins quota system, the Asia-Pacific triangle, and the preference categories, and modifies them to remove a longstanding form of discrimination in our immigration laws.

This specific legislation does not consider in any way, nor does the report, the matter which the Senator from Florida has mentioned, though certainly the matter which the Senator from Florida has mentioned is included generally within the total framework of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is included within the framework of existing law, but not included in any way within the proposed changes in the existing law nor within the purview of the report of the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am not surprised that that is the case.

The Senator and I had a short conference on this subject generally as we were going back to our respective offices. I remember that I assured the distinguished Senator that the suggestion might not be presented by those of us who think differently from himself on this subject. I had felt from what I had heard from the committee that a similar situation existed in the committee.

I was particularly impressed that that must be the case when I noted the decision of the committee and the voting in the Senate on the amendment to which I have referred. I found that the Committee on the Judiciary was seriously divided in its vote. Eight members of the committee voted for the position taken by my distinguished colleague and myself, and seven members voted against that position. The absent member of the committee, making up the 16 in all, declared for that position. So there was a division of 9 to 7 in favor of the position taken by my colleague and myself.

It seemed to me impossible in that situation for the committee to have taken any affirmative position on this issue.

I thank the Senator for having made it abundantly clear by his statement that the committee neither in the bill nor in the report intended to or has taken any position whatever on the question of the admission of nonimmigrant agricultural labor.

I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I join the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] and the distinguished minority whip [Mr. KUCHEL] in commending the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who has opened the debate on this historic bill in a fashion which will do great credit to the Senate, quite aside from the distinction which it will bring to him. With him, I hope that the hour is at hand when we may achieve a goal which many of us shared with his brilliant brother. I am very grateful for the kind words he has spoken.

I reassure the Senator from Florida that I heard the colloquy with respect to agricultural labor, and I share the view of the floor manager of the bill that there is nothing, in the new legislation which we hope will be enacted, that would change existing law or procedures with respect to the admission of migrants or anybody else. The same procedures and clearance requirements which exist today will remain after enactment of this bill.

I join the Senator from Massachusetts also in the deserved high praise he gave the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], whose keen mind and persuasive speech we all admire, who applied those rich gifts to the development of a record upon which the Senate may confidently act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do the remarks of the Senator from Michigan concerning nonimmigrant agricultural labor apply equally to the report of the committee?

Mr. HART. Yes. We are again confronted with the problem that whatever the report might have contained, the bill does not change a line of the existing law with respect to the admission of that category of agricultural labor, or others.

Mr. HOLLAND. The wording in the report which might be construed as applicable to that field was not so intended, and does not in fact apply to nonimmigrant farm labor.

Mr. HART. That is correct. It should not be so construed.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have been involved, as a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization since February, with the processes which have led to the presentation to the Senate of the pending bill. I believe I can truthfully say that the bill in its present form is a result of the legislative process working in its finest fashion. The bill represents the combined efforts of many men who entertain divergent views upon many aspects of the legislation; and it represents a compromise of those divergent positions of interested members of the subcommittee on various features of the bill. In its present form, it is a bill which I can support with good grace.

I do not know whether I could have said that in February, because I frankly concede that I believe in the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act; and had I been permitted to have my way in the framing of the bill, I should have retained the national origins quota system of that act.

I wish to say a few words as to the reason why I believed—and still believe—that the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act presents a desirable formula for the admission of immigrants for permanent residence and ultimate citizenship in the United States.

I disagree with the view that the national origins quota system devised by those two great American legislators, Senator Pat McCarran and Representative Francis Walter, is discriminatory either in purpose or in effect. To be sure, the national origins quota system prescribed by the act which bears the names of those two eminent Americans gave larger quotas to certain of the countries of western and northern Europe than to countries elsewhere in the Eastern Hemisphere. It did so for what I conceive to have been a very good reason, that is, because the people who originally came to the United States from those countries and their descendants constituted the major portion of the population, and thus had made the greatest contributions to the culture and development of America.

In making that statement, I do not assert that the people from northern or western Europe, notably from the British Isles, Ireland, France, the Netherlands, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, are superior to persons in other nations. To the contrary, I assert that anyone who believes in the equality of man should share my views, because if men are truly equal, the people who constitute the most numerous part of the population of any nation are necessarily those who contribute most to that country and its development.

The purpose of the national origins quota system under the McCarran-Walter Act was to receive for permanent residence in America, and for eventual



citizenship, immigrants who had cultural backgrounds similar to those of the people already here, and who for that reason were most readily assimilable into our way of life.

When the committee report was filed, I incorporated certain additional views which appear on pages 56, 57, and 58. These additional views set forth in more detail the reasons why I accept as wise the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the additional views be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the additional views of Mr. ERVIN were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. ERVIN

While I support H.R. 2580, as it is reported by this committee, and while I subscribe to much of the majority report, I must take exception to parts of the purpose of the legislation, as stated by the majority, and amplify the reasons immigration reform is necessary.

As long as I have served in the Senate, there have been constant and consistent harangues—from lobbyists and well-meaning humanitarian organizations, from politicians and Presidents—to the effect that the national origins quota system, as embodied in the McCarran-Walter Act, constitutes a most invidious and evil discrimination against all the people of the world living outside of northern and western Europe. It has been declared in political pamphlets and in congressional hearings that the Congress in 1924 and that two-thirds of the House and two-thirds of the Senate in 1952, declared through legislation that the people of northern and western Europe are superior to those of the rest of the world.

To me, this is mischievous nonsense and sanctimonious propaganda.

The national origins system, just as the system which is encompassed in the present bill, recognizes the necessity for placing restrictions on immigration to the United States. Present law undertakes to assign to each nation in the Eastern Hemisphere a specific quota of immigrants in proportion to the number of Americans whose national origin is traceable to such country.

However philosophers or anthropologists may differ over the correctness of the thesis, the national origins system is based on the proposition that all men are created equal, and that the peoples of various nationalities have made contributions to the development of the United States in proportion to their numbers here. The McCarran-Walter Act is, therefore, based on conditions existing in the United States, and is like a mirror reflecting the United States, allowing the admission of immigrants according to a rational and uniform mathematical formula.

Those who oppose the system do so because relatively larger quotas than they feel are fair are assigned to the United Kingdom, Ireland, France, Germany, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries. This is true, however, only because these countries constitute the most numerous groups in our population and, therefore, have made the greatest contributions to America. In support of this I cite the British Isles, which, in addition to supplying us with a substantial part of our inhabitants, has given us our language, our law, and much of our literature.

When it adopted this definite and uniform rule of law with the view to maintaining the historic population pattern of the United States, Congress did not act upon the theory that the people of one nation are superior or inferior to those of another. Rather, it recognized the obvious and natural fact that

those immigrants can best be assimilated into our society who have relatives, friends, or others of similar backgrounds already here. Again, to use the British Isles as an example, it is abundantly clear that their citizens are quickly and easily assimilable into our life and culture.

As the Christian Science Monitor has editorialized:

"It is no reflection on the many fine American citizens of all races, creeds, and national origins to recognize realistically that some nations are far closer to the United States in culture, customs, standards of living, respect for law, and experience in government."

In spite of the endless protestations against the much maligned national origins system, there is absolutely nothing unjust in it. On the contrary, it admits immigrants from all areas of the earth on an exact mathematical basis having no relation to political pressures.

On the other hand, the bill which was originally presented to this committee, S. 500, was manifestly unjust, both to the American people and to those from other lands who would like to join us. Badly conceived and badly drafted, every provision was sufficiently complex to induce an acute case of mental indigestion. Almost all of the witnesses defending it differed among themselves over the meaning of several sections.

Other than poor draftsmanship, there were two fatal defects in the bill. First, the mathematical formula by which immigration is theoretically determined under the McCarran-Walter Act would be destroyed, and in its place immigration would be managed in the virtually uncontrolled discretion of officials of the executive department, subject to political pressures. Second, S. 500 would have done nothing to control Western Hemisphere immigration. To me, the lack of hemispheric restrictions is the one major defect of the McCarran-Walter Act.

In a speech before the Senate on March 4, 1965, I recognized that the present law is not perfect. But I stated then that "I shall not vote to abandon the national origins quota formula until someone devises a better rule sufficiently strong and certain to insure that immigration to the United States is controlled by the rule of law and not by the caprice of men."

For the reasons outlined in the majority report, I now think such a law has been devised and reported by this committee. As the report states, the McCarran-Walter Act has been largely nullified by amendments and special legislation and no longer effectively restricts immigration. New legislation is now in order for both the Eastern and Western Hemispheres—legislation which will restrict immigration within predictable limits.

This has been accomplished by the committee through adoption of a clear and intelligible bill utilizing a mathematical formula with a numerical ceiling applying to the Eastern Hemisphere, with preferences given to the members of families now in the United States and to members of the professions and arts who can make the greatest contributions to our society. We owe a great debt to the House Immigration Subcommittee and its staff for the creation of this system.

The amendment which I offered and was adopted by the Senate subcommittee, and which would place a ceiling on total Western Hemisphere immigration, must be retained if we are to have a fair, restrictive immigration law. This should be the heart of any reform of our immigration laws. The present rate of immigration from the independent North American countries is already alarmingly high, and, coupled with the population explosion in South America, our duty is clear. It is inconceivable to me that we could enact a law with the alleged purpose of eliminating discrimination and, at the same

time, continue the most apparent discrimination of all—that is, the nonquota status of the Western Hemisphere.

Retention of my amendment in the bill will finally bring us to the point at which we no longer discriminate in favor of the people of Chile over the people of England, or the people of the Dominican Republic over the people of France, our traditional allies since our fight for independence.

There are, of course, other efficacious amendments to present law, some added by the House and others by the Senate subcommittee; and there are other important reasons for reporting H.R. 2580 than those I have mentioned. However, these are adequately covered in the majority report.

In closing these separate views, I would like to acknowledge my personal gratification, which I am sure is shared by all members of the subcommittee, to the staff of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, for the devotion and tireless efforts which they gave to us over these months of hearings and executive session. Without their dedication, we could not have accomplished our task of processing an intelligent and effective bill.

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I knew, however, as the subcommittee began its work upon the immigration bill originally introduced by the able and distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and various cosponsors, that the McCarran-Walter Act had been the subject of prolonged attack, and had fallen into disfavor with a majority of the Members of Congress, and that those who did not entertain my view about the wisdom of the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Act relating to the national origins quota system had sufficient votes to eliminate that formula from the pending legislation.

That discovery presented to me two possible courses of action. The first was that I might concentrate my efforts in a forlorn fight to preserve the national origins quota system and suffer defeat in such fight without rendering any service to my country, other than that of loyalty to an ideal which I cherished.

The second possible course of action which confronted me was to join with other members of the subcommittee in an effort to present to the Senate the best possible obtainable immigration law, curing the defects of present law, without the retention of the national origins quota system.

I felt that I could serve my country best by adopting the second alternative. That is the reason which prompted me to join the other members of the subcommittee, and particularly those whose names I enumerated in my colloquy with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], in fashioning the present bill, which in my judgment represents the best immigration law obtainable at present.

Also, as the Senator from Massachusetts has stated—and he has cited statistics which support his statement—the number of nonquota immigrants received in this country in recent years from the Eastern Hemisphere has exceeded the number of immigrants we have received under the quotas established by the national origins system. This has been due, among other things, to the necessity for admitting many refugees who were

fleeing religious and political oppression. The fact is, as the Senator stated, that the system is simply not working.

The House subcommittee, and its members deserve the thanks of the country for devising an intelligent, intelligible and precise mathematical formula for the Eastern Hemisphere by which immigration will be impartially determined. Under it, the most important and admirable purposes of the administration will be accomplished far more effectively than would have been true under the original bill. The reunification of families will be achieved, and we will be assured of receiving the best qualified immigrants. The preference system adopted by the House will assure America of receiving the most easily assimilable and most desirable prospects for citizenship.

The House also imposed new labor restrictions on all prospective immigrants which will have the effect of removing their threat to increased unemployment. Too, it added new and greatly needed security measures without removing any of those presently existing.

This is not to say that H.R. 2580 as it was reported to the Senate was a perfect bill, or even one which I could support, for it still lacked the key ingredient of any meaningful reform—that is, a limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration. However, the genesis of good legislation was there, and the Senate Subcommittee proceeded with the same resolve and dedication as did the House subcommittee.

Several substantive, as well as technical and clarifying, amendments were added which improved the measure. Among these, is one I offered, to allow alien seamen who entered the United States illegally the same opportunity to apply for an adjustment of status for reasons of hardship after 7 years residence as have other immigrants who entered the country illegally. I have always felt that like people in like circumstances should be treated by the law in a like manner, and I see no reason to treat seamen differently from other aliens. Also, it seems to me that if a man has found a job and a home here and has been assimilated into our society, he should be allowed to remain. This is an elementary proposition, and I am confident the amendment will be retained. However, this is not the amendment which has aroused the most controversy concerning the bill in its present form.

There was one serious defect in the bill before us, and in the McCarran-Walter Act; and that defect arose out of the fact that while existing immigration laws placed a limitation upon the number of immigrants receivable from countries of the Eastern Hemisphere, they placed no limitation whatever upon the number of immigrants admissible from the Western Hemisphere.

I know of no one in Congress at the present moment who favors unrestricted immigration. I am satisfied, from my work with them, that all of the other members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the

Senate Committee on the Judiciary favor reasonable restrictions on immigration, and that such disagreements that may have existed in the past in respect to this point were concerned only with ways in which that objective could be best attained.

I felt that it was unjust to all the people of the Western Hemisphere for the United States to say, "We are willing to have all of you move into the United States," and at that same time place in the immigration laws provisions which would deny them admission, after such a broad invitation had been extended, because of their failure to meet certain labor requirements of the laws. To my mind, there was a certain amount of hypocrisy in the immigration laws which made that proclamation and had that effect. It seemed to me that it was like inviting a man to dinner, and then digging a pit for him to fall into before he could get to the dinner table.

Accordingly, I thought that, in order to abolish the hypocrisy which our existing immigration laws practice, telling the people of the Western Hemisphere that they are all welcome to move into the United States immediately, we should place a reasonable limitation upon immigration from the countries of the Western Hemisphere, as we did in the case of immigration from the countries of the Eastern Hemisphere.

I felt that in addition to there being something in the nature of legislative hypocrisy in the existing immigration laws in this respect, it was also a gross discrimination against all the people of the Eastern Hemisphere for us to have immigration laws which specified that only a limited number could come in from the Eastern Hemisphere but that, on the contrary, unlimited numbers could move into the United States from the Western Hemisphere.

For that reason, I submitted an amendment to provide a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere. As the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has stated, the pending bill, with that amendment, would place a limitation on immigrants from the Western Hemisphere of 120,000 annually, plus the spouses and the children of American citizens who may come from those countries outside and above the limitation.

To enable the immigration authorities to adjust their action to this new limitation, the bill would provide that it would not become effective until the 1st day of July 1968.

To me, it is vitally important for the amendment to be retained in the Senate and for the Senate conferees to insist upon its retention, in the event it should become necessary to have a conference with the House upon the bill.

Those who disagree with the wisdom of my amendment contend that special privileges are warranted by the special relationship which exists between us and our hemispheric neighbors.

I submit that there is no relationship which is closer or more special than that which our country bears to England, our great ally, which gave us our language, our law, and much of our liter-

ature. Yet, under the pending bill, those who disagree with me express no shock that Britain, in the future, can send us 10,000 fewer immigrants than she has sent on an annual average in the past. They are only shocked that British Guiana cannot send us every single citizen of that country who wishes to come.

Those who disagree with me on this point say that there is nothing invidious in the discrimination in favor of the Western Hemisphere, because the discrimination "is not based on race, religion, or ethnic origin." They fail to note that every witness at the hearings agreed with me that there was also no discrimination based on race, religion, or ethnic origin in the national origins quota system of the McCarran-Walter Act. Yet, those who disagree with me never failed to take the opportunity to castigate that system as discriminatory.

Mr. President, a man born in England, be he Catholic, Jew, or Protestant, is charged to the British quota. The system allows immigration according to place of birth, just as the present bill does. Under it, a person born in the Western Hemisphere would be charged to the Western Hemisphere ceiling. A man born in the Eastern Hemisphere would be charged to the Eastern Hemisphere ceiling.

This bill creates a commission to study the Western Hemisphere problem, among others. I suggest the possibility that this commission might find that the ceiling which the bill establishes for immigration from the Western Hemisphere is still too discriminatory, since it allows 45 percent of immigrants to come from only 15 percent of the world's population.

I have also heard it said that the ceiling will somehow adversely affect the Alliance for Progress. This is a perverse argument, indeed, since under the labor restrictions imposed, we will take only the best of those we are helping to train. I hope that those in charge of administering the Alliance for Progress will understand the necessity of keeping the best qualified where they are most needed, which is in the Latin American countries.

The substance of my amendment has been endorsed by the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Minneapolis Tribune, the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and the distinguished columnist Charles Bartlett.

On July 17, 1965, the New York Times published an editorial entitled "Progress on Immigration." I wish to read this portion:

Secretary Rusk urges that Latin-American nations remain outside any ceiling, as they are now outside of the quota system. But this well-intentioned position could lead to trouble and ill will in the not so distant future if immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean should grow sharply—as there are signs that it will—and pressure were then built up to limit a sudden flood of immigrants for which the country was unprepared. While the entire law is being overhauled, it would be better to place all the nations of the world, including those to the south of the United States, on exactly the same footing.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times may be



printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PROGRESS ON IMMIGRATION

The Johnson administration has intervened to unshackle the tangled threads of the immigration reform bill in the House.

Personal animosity between Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, the ranking member, has previously made agreement impossible on a measure to repeal the national origins quota system. In a letter from Secretary of State Rusk, the administration discloses that it does not regard adoption of major provisions of the Feighan bill as too high a price to pay for his support.

The national origins quota system would be abolished immediately, as Mr. FEIGHAN suggests, rather than phased out over the next 5 years. The administration has also softened its opposition to Mr. FEIGHAN's proposal for an annual ceiling on immigration. If set at 235,000 persons, the ceiling proposed by Mr. FEIGHAN, this figure would be tantamount to a cut of 55,000 from the existing rate. If a ceiling is to be set, it should not be lower than the present level.

Secretary Rusk urges that Latin-American nations remain outside any ceiling, as they are now outside of the quota system. But this well-intentioned position could lead to trouble and ill will in the not so distant future if immigration from Latin America and the Caribbean should grow sharply—as there are signs that it will—and pressure were then built up to limit a sudden flood of immigrants for which the country was unprepared. While the entire law is being overhauled, it would be better to place all the nations of the world, including those to the south of the United States, on exactly the same footing.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Christian Science Monitor for August 17, 1965, carried an editorial entitled "New World Immigration." I wish to read these words from that editorial:

It would seem that a reasonable, legal limitation on migration from Latin America, if adopted today, could prevent the need to adopt more stringent legislation tomorrow.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NEW WORLD IMMIGRATION

Applying intense pressure, the administration struck from the immigration reform bill a measure which many experts believe will have to be faced in the near future. This was a provision which would have placed a limit on migration into the United States from the rest of the New World.

Administration opposition centered on the claim that to impose such a limit would endanger diplomatic relations with several Latin American states. This seems like an inadequate excuse for several reasons. We find it hard to believe that any government believes its citizens have a right per se to migrate to any other country. In the second place, certain of the New World lands themselves place high hurdles before many U.S. citizens where immigration is concerned. Thus Mexico virtually demands that a newcomer, including one from the United States, be financially independent before going to Mexico to live, and there

are signs that Canada unofficially discourages immigration of nonwhites, among them American Negroes.

But all such considerations aside, Washington must surely realize that, at any moment, it could face a deluge of would-be Latin American immigrants. The flood of Puerto Ricans which has poured into New York, and the wave of Jamaicans which has flowed into Britain during the last 15 years are but tokens of the vast numbers who might someday wish to leave underdeveloped homelands.

For two crucial facts must be faced. The first is that the population of Latin America is growing more rapidly than that of any other large area in the world. The second is that, on the whole, the Latin American nations are failing to solve their economic problems. Thus the pressure on resources grows and grows. Eventually Latin Americans from many lands may decide to do what Puerto Ricans and Mexicans have done in such large numbers: go to the United States.

It would seem that a reasonable, legal limit on migration from Latin America, if adopted today, could prevent the need to adopt more stringent legislation tomorrow.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on August 25, 1965, the St. Paul Pioneer Press carried an editorial entitled "New Immigration Danger." In the course of the editorial, the Pioneer Press made this observation:

For example, no more than 20,000 persons could be admitted from the United Kingdom in 1 year, but such countries as El Salvador, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Argentina could send unlimited numbers.

This editorial proceeded to take the position that the better part of wisdom at this time required the placing of a limitation, as this bill does, upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial from the St. Paul Pioneer Press be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NEW IMMIGRATION DANGER

Under the flimsy and foolish pretext of making a friendly gesture to Central and South America, the State Department and the Johnson administration propose to revise but maintain numerical limits on immigration from all the rest of the world, but to leave the doors wide open for a flood of Latin Americans.

A revolt against this dangerous and unjustified favoritism is forming among House Members. One of the leaders is Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, of Minnesota, backed by many Republicans, but also supported by numerous Democrats. Their efforts deserve backing from the public and from Congress.

What has happened in the House is that the bill to abolish the national origins quota system for regulating immigration has been twisted into a vehicle for a new form of discrimination. While an overall limit of 170,000 immigrants a year is set for all the nations outside the Western Hemisphere, including England, West Germany, the Scandinavian nations and Italy, no limits whatever are provided for the Latin American countries. Furthermore, there is an individual national quota maximum of only 20,000 for each nation outside the hemisphere, but no national limit in Latin America.

For example, no more than 200,000 persons could be admitted from the United Kingdom in 1 year, but such countries as El

Salvador, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Argentina could send unlimited numbers.

To call this bill nondiscriminatory is hypocrisy. It discriminates against the nations that have traditionally supplied America with desirable immigrants.

Such a policy does not make sense. If we are to replace the national origins principle with the theory that immigrants should be judged on their character and ability, regardless of nationality, then the Latin Americans should come under the same rules, and there should be a maximum quota for them as well as for others.

This is especially important now because Latin America is rapidly becoming one of the world's biggest surplus population areas. Latin America has millions more people than it can support or educate at decent levels, and is doing nothing to control its population explosion. In Salvador alone some 700,000 people have overflowed into neighboring Honduras. In Colombia the politicians are talking of wholesale exportation of emigrants into other countries because of unemployment and poverty.

The situation obviously could develop into a serious U.S. immigration problem if no checks are provided. Congressman MACGREGOR proposes to amend the House bill to put a yearly ceiling of about 140,000 on all Latin American immigrants, which would be in addition of the 170,000 to be permitted from other parts of the world. This is a generous allowance.

The flood of Puerto Ricans that has poured into New York in recent years, with all their problems of language and poverty, should be sufficient warning to the United States. Without reasonable restrictions, the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean islands could in the future provide a deluge of immigrants that would be difficult to assimilate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on August 25, 1965, the Minneapolis Tribune, of Minneapolis, Minn., carried an editorial entitled "Immigration and the Population Problem." This editorial commented upon an amendment then pending to the House bill which had been offered by Representative MACGREGOR to place a limitation on immigration from the Western Hemisphere, and it referred to the opposition of the State Department to the placing of any such limitation upon immigration. It said this on that point:

The State Department argues that a limitation would be an affront to Latin America. MacGregor answers more soundly that the time to set restrictions is now, rather than when the problem becomes more acute.

His view is reinforced by an estimate from the international family planning conference at Geneva this week that the population of Latin America will increase 3.6 times by the end of this century. The pressure to escape to a more moderately expanding United States is likely to grow.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### IMMIGRATION AND THE POPULATION PROBLEM

Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican of Minnesota, and House Republicans are trying to put a limit on the number of immigrants from other Western Hemisphere nations. At present there is no quota for them.

The State Department argues that a limitation would be an affront to Latin America.

MACGREGOR answers more soundly that the time to set restrictions is now, rather than when the problem becomes more acute.

His view is reinforced by an estimate from the international family planning conference at Geneva this week that the population of Latin America will increase 3.6 times by the end of this century. The pressure to escape to a more moderately expanding United States is likely to grow.

Indeed, in an era when overpopulation looms as one of the world's toughest questions, there is doubt about the United States undertaking an enlarged role as safety valve for nations which do not control their own numbers.

Present legislation bases immigration quotas on the ethnic makeup of this country in 1920. Quotas for western and northern European countries seldom have been filled. Applications from southern Europe and other areas far exceed openings. Thus some juggling of qualifications is needed.

But the effect of the pending bill would be to boost total immigration from the present 300,000 to about 350,000. About 130,000 now arrive annually outside the quotas from other western hemisphere nations. Without the limitation MACGREGOR seeks, this number could jump sharply.

Regarding U.S. growth rates, the Population Reference Bureau remarked: "At present we are on a collision course that could lead us to catastrophe, timed to arrive only a few decades after our sister nations (if they do not alter their growth rates) have crashed on the Malthusian reefs."

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Washington Evening Star for August 24, 1965, carried a column by Charles Bartlett entitled "Revolt Brewing on Immigration," in which he had some comments to make on this point. I shall read this portion of the column:

Since most Latin governments do not currently recognize their population problems, the imposition of a quota will provoke less diplomatic tension now than it will later when overpopulation becomes acute. Congress enactment of the quota may actually jolt the Latins into more realistic attitudes.

The arguments for establishing the quotas now are so compelling and the diplomatic consequences are so nebulous that some Congressmen suspect that Rusk and Mann are resisting it purely in terms of diplomatic expediency. Their stand on immigration is certainly inconsistent with their refusal to endorse preferential trade arrangements within the Western Hemisphere.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire column of Charles Bartlett, be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVOLT BREWING ON IMMIGRATION  
(By Charles Bartlett)

There are signs of revolt by the House of Representatives against the intermingling of immigration policy and short-term diplomacy in the stand taken by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the new immigration bill.

Rusk is urging Congress to abolish the individual country quotas that have controlled migration to the United States since 1924. He echoes the widespread sentiment that these quotas are discriminatory and damaging to the Nation's reputation for fairness. But Rusk also urges that the Latin American Republics continue to be excluded, as they have since 1924, from the overall limitation that the new bill will place upon migration to this country.

Representative MICHAEL FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, leading the move to revamp

immigration policy, has doggedly questioned the special access of Latin immigrants. Why is it fair, he has asked, for people all over the world to stand in line for quota numbers while South Americans enter the United States simply by showing that they are unlikely to become public charges?

FEIGHAN hoped to end this special status in the new immigration law but he met objections from the State Department after the crisis erupted in the Dominican Republic. Rusk and Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann argued earnestly that this move would weaken the U.S. standing in Latin America at a critical moment. Further persuasions by President Johnson induced FEIGHAN to agree to a compromise.

The Feighan bill now before the House requires the President to notify Congress when immigrations from the Western Hemisphere start to rise sharply. Latin immigrants will be subject, like all others, to the Labor Department's certification that they possess needed skills not already available in the pool of unemployed.

But this compromise has not allayed the alarm of some Members at demographers' projections that the population of South America will multiply in this century from 69 to 600 million. The growth of Latin migrations to the United States in this decade, from 95,701 in 1960 to 139,282 in 1964, has added substance to warnings that the time is ripe to erect a dam against a possible flood of immigrants.

The Latin political leaders, with a few exceptions, are so hesitant to acknowledge their population problems that a strong initiative by the Ecumenical Council will be necessary to prod them into a population control campaign. Most observers doubt that the council will produce a fulsome endorsement of birth control this fall. Meanwhile, about 700,000 Salvadorans have quietly overflowed into neighboring Honduras, and the Colombians talk of exporting masses of unemployed workers to Europe.

Representative CLARK MACGREGOR, Republican, of Minnesota, who proposes to establish an annual limit of 115,000 immigrants from the 24 nations of the Western Hemisphere, points out that the State Department merely wants to postpone the action. Rusk said during the hearings, "I am suggesting that Congress wait until there is a need to do it."

MACGREGOR argues that it will be wiser and more realistic to meet the problem during this reform of immigration policy than to wait until the crisis develops. Communists will maintain that the limitation is new evidence of Washington's detachment from the hemisphere's problem, but their charges will be softened by the present scope of this country's contributions to the Alliance for Progress.

Since most Latin governments do not currently recognize their population problems, the imposition of a quota will provoke less diplomatic tension now than it will later when overpopulation becomes acute. Congress' enactment of the quota may actually jolt the Latins into more realistic attitudes.

The arguments for establishing the quotas now are so compelling and the diplomatic consequences are so nebulous that some Congressmen suspect that Rusk and Mann are resisting it purely in terms of diplomatic expediency. Their stand on immigration is certainly inconsistent with their refusal to endorse preferential trade arrangements within the Western Hemisphere.

The key virtue of the new immigration bill is that it has been drafted in a practical and unsentimental spirit of fairness toward all nations. The preferential treatment of South America cannot be maintained if the United States is to boast truthfully that its new policy does not put one nation or region ahead of another.

Mr. ERVIN. The Christian Science Monitor for September 3, 1965, contained a column by Richard L. Strout entitled "Immigration and Quotas," which makes some significant comments in urging the imposition of limitation upon immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the article of Mr. Strout.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND QUOTAS  
(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—It seems a bit odd, doesn't it, that the United States should cut immigration from England by a third while it jumps immigration from Trinidad-Tobago from a limit of 100 a year to no limit at all?

The House of Representatives has just passed its version of the new immigration law, scrapping the old national origins system and substituting a new system. There has never been a quota system for the Western Hemisphere, and under the House version this situation will continue.

Trinidad-Tobago is only used in this article for the purpose of illustration. Trinidad-Tobago used to be a British colony and as such got the minimum of 100 immigrants a year in the old, "bad" national origins system. However, Britain has made Trinidad-Tobago independent, along with Jamaica. Independent nations in the Western Hemisphere are entitled to send as many immigrants to the United States as they wish, subject, however, to sharp administrative checks by the Labor and Justice Departments.

The generous United States, with 4½ percent unemployment, is throwing open its doors to these two countries at a time when the Socialist Labor government in England is cutting immigration from the Caribbean from 20,000 a year to 8,500. England has decided that immigration is not a cure-all for national problems, even among Commonwealth countries.

Nothing that I write is meant to be critical of either Jamaica or Trinidad-Tobago. The two new nations are delightful islands discovered by Columbus, with mixed populations, the one of about 1,700,000 and the other of around 900,000.

Theoretically, so far as fixed quotas go, their entire population will be able to move en masse to New York City. Actually, however, sharp restrictions are applied to immigration administratively, to protect the American economy from job competition.

The passé old national origins quota system is assailed on all sides today as being discriminatory. But isn't it a bit discriminatory to put a quota of 20,000 a year on England, which last year sent over about 30,000 people, and no quota on Trinidad-Tobago? The Western Hemisphere has always been exempt from quotas. Under the House version of the new bill it would stay exempt. Some Senators say, however, that it is time to bring the Western Hemisphere under the same rules as the rest of the world, that "nondiscriminatory" means what it says.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk wants the Western Hemisphere exempted, however, because it has a "special relationship" with the United States. The United Kingdom does not have this special relationship, it appears.

The proposed new bill puts an overall ceiling of 170,000 on immigration from all non-Western Hemisphere countries. This will be allocated on a first come, first served



basis, with preferences to families of immigrants already here, and with no nation getting more than 20,000. No nation, that is, outside of the Western Hemisphere.

Latin America currently has the highest growth rate in the world. Famine and the population may be on a collision course. Can the United States, with all the sympathy and pity in the world, really hope to solve foreign problems by taking in immigrants?

Mr. ERVIN. During hearings on the bill many outstanding Americans appeared before the committee. One of them who impressed me most was a distinguished and eloquent attorney of Wilmington, Del., Joseph A. L. Errigo. Mr. Errigo is the national chairman of the Sons of Italy.

Mr. Errigo disagreed with me in respect to retaining the National Origins Quota System of the McCarran-Walter Act.

After my amendment, limiting immigration from the Western Hemisphere, had been adopted by the subcommittee and approved by the full committee, I received from Mr. Errigo a fine letter endorsing the proposal.

With his consent, I quote the following words from the letter:

I am writing to congratulate you and to thank you for the excellent position you have taken relative to the immigration bill. Since we have established a ceiling for the rest of the world, it is altogether fitting and proper that we should establish a ceiling for the Western Hemisphere as well. This is in accord with our philosophy of equal justice under law for all.

Those of us on the Immigration Subcommittee know Mr. Errigo to be a persistent foe on all he considers to be unjust law. We know him also as a consistent champion of equal application of law.

Mr. Errigo knows we must eliminate the most apparent discrimination of all—that which gives preference to the people of Chile over the people of Italy, and the people of Cuba over the people of France, our historic ally since the time of our independence.

Although equal application of the law to all nations was my principal reason for proposing the amendment, there is another reason. There is a growing demand for immigration from our hemispheric neighbors.

Immigration from the Western Hemisphere increased by 50 percent in the past decade to our present average of almost 150,000 a year. As Senators know, our own population is also increasing alarmingly; yet 5 percent of the annual additions to our total population comes from Western immigrants, and the percentage is going up.

Of all the countries in our hemisphere, demographers tell us that only Mexico's rate of immigration—which numbers from 30,000 and 50,000 to the United States each year—will remain stable.

The problem in Canada is so serious, that officials of its Government have considered establishing restrictions to prohibit the great migration to the United States, which like Mexico's has averaged 30,000 to 50,000 a year. Pres-

ently, for every professional person who migrates to Canada, two leave, the principal reason being the higher salaries paid in the United States. There is also increasing pressure from the labor force for immigrant passports, this being the product of Canada's greatest domestic problem—unemployment. The unemployment rate in Canada has averaged 6 percent in recent years. If we accept the proposition that an increasing professional force generates employment in the labor force, then we must conversely also assume that Canada's problem will worsen and that migration to the United States will increase.

As my friends who oppose the amendment point out, "the majority of hemisphere immigrants come to us from Canada and Mexico." Although it is certainly true that the immigration from these two countries will not decrease, it is also clear that the time is fast approaching when we will receive even more from the other hemispheric countries.

The bill should not offend Canada and Mexico, because of the distinction it makes between the Eastern Hemisphere and the Western Hemisphere. The bill provides that no country of the Eastern Hemisphere shall be allowed to send to this country in any one year more than 20,000 immigrants, outside of members of families.

The bill places no such limitation upon the various nations of the Western Hemisphere, and for this reason Canada and Mexico can continue to send into this country their immigrants free from any limitation other than the overall hemispheric limitation of 120,000.

I spoke a moment ago about the probability—indeed, I say the certainty—that immigration from South America, Central America, and the Caribbean Islands will increase with the passage of years. Undoubtedly it will become unmanageable unless we place realistic limitations on immigration from the Western Hemisphere.

Immigration from South America has increased by a fantastic 230 percent in the last 5 years, and by almost 400 percent in the last 10 years. It is approaching the point where it will double each year. The figures for Central America are almost as high. This is not just a trend; it is a threatened avalanche.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I find the able address of the distinguished Senator interesting and informative.

I wonder if the Senator would be so kind as to give the actual figures on immigration from South America, as well as percentages?

Mr. ERVIN. I will have my assistant mark the figures for me and I will give them to the Senator from Tennessee in just a few minutes. While he is doing that and to expedite matters, I will continue with my discussion.

The reason why the immigration from South America, Central America, and the Caribbean Islands is increasing is not hard to find. It has a population explosion unequalled in any other area of the world.

In 1900, the population of Central and South America was approximately 60 million. By the end of the century it will be 600 million. In 1900 1 of every 50 human beings who inhabited the earth lived in the nations of Central and South America; today the ratio is 1 in 15. This great, new mass is not shifting to the broad uninhabited expanse of the continent, but to the overcrowded cities, and then, often to America.

The situation is substantially the same in the Caribbean Island nations, except for the fact that there is less room. There, the population is increasing at a rate of 25 percent every 10 years, although the density of population is already too high for adequate support of the present inhabitants. To use one island as an example, if the present population growth rate of Barbados is maintained, in 200 years there will not be room for all the inhabitants to stand on the island.

The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] say there is no real hemispheric immigration problem now. They are correct insofar as their separate views were filed on September 15, 1965.

But the problem is coming fast and hard. Both the Attorney General and the Secretary of State testified to this in the hearings before the House subcommittee; and the Members of the Senate should make no mistake about it.

Attorney General Katzenbach and Secretary Rusk stated their preference for waiting until a later date to meet the problem. But at a later date we would be enacting special restrictions for a special area. The wrath of the hemisphere would be upon us.

I say the time is now—now, when we are broadly revising our whole policy; now, when we are supposedly abolishing discrimination; now, when it is politically and practically possible.

With my amendment, this is a good bill. To strike the amendment or to emasculate it would be to perform heart surgery on healthy legislation.

Without my amendment, or without its substance, it would be difficult for me to support the pending bill with any enthusiasm whatsoever. But with this amendment, I can support the pending bill with enthusiasm, because I know that it is the best bill upon immigration that can be obtained for our Nation at present.

First Timothy, verse 8, gives us some advice that we should follow in enacting an immigration law. It is more timely than the great poem by Emma Lazarus, which is inscribed upon the monument on Ellis Island. This world is confronted at this moment by a population explosion, and soon millions of immigrants will be begging for, indeed demanding, admission to the United States. The United States will have trouble providing employment for its own expanding and increasing population. Therefore, this is the opportune time to enact an immigration law which is based upon the theory that we should restrict immigration to immigrants whose presence

here will reunite families already partially in America and immigrants who have some real contribution to make by reason of their skills to the economic welfare of America.

We should fashion our immigration law in accord with the interests of the United States, and the interests of the United States alone, and not our supposition as to what the thoughts or desires of some people in foreign countries may be. I believe the writer of First Timothy had this in mind when he said, in chapter 5, verse 8:

If any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

In advocating the passage of the bill in its present form, I am appealing to the Senate to look after those of our own household by enacting an immigration law which takes cognizance of matters of the heart insofar as it will result in uniting families now divided, and which takes cognizance of the best interests of the United States in restricting other immigration to those who have something to contribute to the economic and cultural development of our Nation.

Mr. President, in answer to the earlier inquiry of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], page 48 of the annual report of the Immigration Service shows that immigration from South America in 1955 was 5,500. In 1960, the number jumped to 13,000. In 1964, it jumped to 31,102. While these figures in and of themselves are not alarming, the trend which they reflect is greatly alarming.

In many nations of South America, most of the land is owned by persons who can only properly be called land barons. They show no interest whatever in taking a course of action which would provide for wide diffusion of ownership of the land among their people. If the United States places a limitation upon immigration from those countries, notice would be served on these land barons that they would have to do something like that which is suggested in the eighth verse of the fifth chapter of First Timothy; namely, look after some of their own household.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, much has been said and written in connection with proposed changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act to the effect that there is something intrinsically evil about the national origins quota system on which the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act is based. Indeed, many have sought to picture the national origins quota system as a product of prejudice, bias, and racism, and, as such, an affront to many nations of

the world constituting a detriment to the conduct of our foreign relations.

Such allegations indicate a lack of understanding, to put it charitably.

There is nothing in the national origins quota system which has any connotation of the idea of racial superiority or racial inferiority. This system is, indeed, inconsistent with any such concept.

The national origins quotas are based on the ethnic proportions of the American population in 1920, and are so constituted with the express and acknowledged purpose of preventing immigration from changing the national or ethnic composition of the American population.

The wish to preserve one's identity and the identity of one's nation requires no justification—and no belief in racial or national superiority—any more than the wish to have one's own children, and to continue one's family through them, need be justified or rationalized by a belief that they are superior to the children of others. One identifies with one's family, because it is one's family, and not because they are better than other people. For no other reason, one identifies with one's national group more than with others. This is the sole basis of the preference which is inherent in the national quota system.

There is no merit in the contention that the quota system is racist or morally wrong. Individuals, and groups, including nations, have an absolute and unchallenged right to have preferences for other individuals or groups, and nothing could be more natural than a preference based on a sense of identity.

No apology is necessary for an immigration law based on the national origins quota system, and I make none.

Having so stated, I would add that I do not consider the existing law without defect, nor do I believe that the immigration formula in the proposal now before the Senate, if properly administered, will result in drastic or undesirable changes in the patterns of immigration into the United States. The preferences which would be established by this proposal are based, I believe, on sound reasoning and meritorious considerations, not entirely dissimilar in effect from those which underlie the national origins quotas of existing law. Blood relationships and family ties stem from the same sense of identity and preference, and it is most desirable that unification of families be a major consideration in our immigration formula. The bill before the Senate also wisely provides protection for American workers against job displacement by immigrants.

I think the bill has been improved by the amendment added by the Senate Judiciary Committee which provides for a maximum limit on Western Hemisphere immigration. If passed, it would constitute a badly needed improvement in the existing law which has no numerical limitation on Western Hemisphere immigration.

It is inescapable, however, Mr. President, that the major changes proposed are in the formula for immigration and mechanics of selection. There is a larger, and I believe, a far more significant consideration, which has been ig-

nored in considering what changes are needed in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Both the present law, based on a national origins quota system, and the proposed changes now before the Senate, are based on the assumption that the country is underpopulated and could use substantial quantities of immigration to advantage. This assumption, formerly well founded, is no longer true or soundly based.

From a superficial view, it would appear that the comparative population density of the United States might justify a continuation, although hardly an increase, such as is likely under the proposed bill, of the very substantial flow of immigration into the United States. A comparative approach based on overall population density is completely misleading, however.

U.S. population distribution is unique, and destined to become more so. A major geographic proportion of the United States is devoted to agricultural pursuits, but the population density of this area is significantly slight. At the present time, less than 6 percent of the population of the United States is engaged in agriculture, and both the percentage and the number of persons so engaged is steadily declining. Even this relatively small percentage of the population is producing a substantial surplus of food and fiber for the Nation's needs. As the process of mechanization continues, even fewer people will be needed to farm this given area and to produce sufficient food and fibers for the rapidly growing population. In comparison to the 6 percent of the U.S. population now engaged in farming, other countries have the following percentages of their population working to produce food and fiber on the farms: France, 25 percent; Poland, 38 percent; Japan, 38 percent; Argentina, 20 percent; Soviet Union, 57 percent; and Canada, 12 percent.

As a consequence, the distribution of U.S. population is weighted more heavily in urban areas than in other nations. As the population expands, the increased population density falls almost entirely in urban areas.

Even in the absence of any immigration in the next half decade, the population of the United States will shortly pass the 200 million mark. And only shortly thereafter—a matter of not more than 2 or 3 years—there will be 200 million people in the urban areas alone. Our present rate of population growth, even exclusive of immigration, is the highest of any industrial nation. It is the population density in the urban areas of the United States, therefore, on which the need for further major immigration should be judged.

From this perspective, it becomes readily apparent that it is not advantageous to the United States to continue to encourage the massive immigration which prevails under present law, much less increased immigration, as would be the case under the proposed changes.

The wise course for the United States to follow is to limit immigration to special cases based on such factors as family reunification and some forms of political refugee accommodation. These



factors could be accommodated within an overall immigration ceiling of certainly not more than 50,000 per year from all sources.

Populationwise, the United States has reached maturity. The time has come for our immigration policy to reflect a corresponding maturity. This is not a harsh judgment, merely a realistic one.

Most of the countries of the world have problems stemming from expanding populations. We cannot solve the population problems of one of these other countries by permitting immigration to the United States, even if we concentrated immigration favoritism on any particular one of them, without exceeding by far any maximum level of immigration yet seriously proposed. We cannot help other nations by weakening ourselves, nor should we if we could.

Without the necessity for balancing the merits of the formulas in existing and proposed laws, therefore, I must conclude that neither is responsive to the national needs. The McCarran-Walter Act was designed to meet needs for immigration which clearly existed before the turn of the century, diminishingly so thereafter, and not at all in the circumstances of the last two decades. The changes here proposed are based on the assumption that the immigration needs of the country three-quarters of a century ago remain the same. The contrary is true.

For these reasons, I cannot support H.R. 2580. Perhaps the realization of the requirements stemming from the increased population density and necessarily uneven population distribution in the United States in the past few decades is not sufficiently prevalent to permit drastic changes toward limitations on immigration at this time. Under no circumstances, however, can the Nation afford an updating of the official acceptance of the myth that we can still benefit from a continuation or increase in the current level of immigration.

I hope that the Senate, in the best interest of the country, will reject the 19th century concept on which this bill is premised, and take no major action until the Congress is at least willing to meet the needs of the 20th century, not to mention the future.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I support the pending legislation to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The bill is modest and right. It falls in America's mainstream of morality and commonsense.

The bill represents a broadly based consensus on the kind of reform that is needed. It carries out goals sought by 33 Senators, from both political parties, who joined with me to introduce this legislation following President Johnson's immigration message to Congress last January.

The heroes, Mr. President, of this long and historic struggle to achieve the abolition of the national origins system of selectivity, are properly tens of thousands of Americans. They have organized through community, religious and fraternal groups to achieve the victory now being consummated in the Congress.

It is to these Americans, who in years past opened their homes, their communities, their businesses to welcome the refugee, the relative and the homeless of the world. These citizens conducted community conferences and urged their national organizations to press for immigration reform. Today is their victory.

It is impossible today to list each citizen, each fraternal chapter, each religious society that shares in this achievement. But two national organizations deserve special mention.

For many years the American Immigration and Citizenship Conference has led in education and information. Through national conferences and community workshops the hopes of Americans for this achievement were effectively directed.

This year an additional citizens group, the National Committee for Immigration Reform, whose outstanding membership is headed by former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight Eisenhower, has organized to insure passage of this legislation.

Indeed, this proposal is supported by the most distinguished of our citizens, as well as the humble from every corner of the Nation. It is as though each wants to help brighten the light that shines its welcome in the torch of liberty.

To the peoples of Europe chiefly, but to others as well, the United States has long been a haven of opportunity and refuge. The stream of immigrants who have passed through America's gates are indeed the Nation's true wealth.

Today, America's worth and strength—morally, intellectually, politically, socially, economically—rest upon the contributions of people of many national backgrounds and races. This is the unquestioned genius of the American experience.

Throughout most of our history, accepted national policy was to encourage a free flow of immigration. And even though, beginning in 1882, our immigration history reveals a slow evolution from an open to a restricted policy, the gates stoop open to most until after the end of World War I.

Several things then worked to generate a widespread demand for immigration curbs. Among them were post-war urbanization, economic dislocation, waves of fear, and suspicion, and the degenerate nativism practiced by the Ku Klux Klan and its allies. The Quota Acts of 1921 and 1924 followed.

This legislation of the 1920's marked the turning point in America's immigration policy. A dual control system went into effect, which continues to our time. The first selection of immigrants was through the application of such standards of admissibility as health, literacy, security, and financial responsibility. These are sound and right, and have been retained in the pending bill.

The second control was restriction of quota immigration to a specified maximum number per year based on nation of birth.

No responsible citizen, Mr. President, questions the rightness of any nation to regulate immigration. But more than

an attempt to set a reasonable rate of immigration, with reasonable standards, was involved in the dual control system. It was framed by an irrational element—the national origins quota concept, which said in echoing words that the people of some nations are more welcome to America than others. We know the story well. Unjustified ethnic and racial barriers became the basis of U.S. immigration policy.

The end of World War II brought hope for basic reform, especially following America's welcome to thousands of homeless and destitute people through the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. But this hope was short-lived. In 1952, over President Truman's veto, Congress enacted the present basic statute, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. Revision and codification of immigration law was overdue. But so far as the basic selection of immigrants was concerned, the 1952 act followed the discriminatory policy of the twenties.

In his 1952 veto message, President Truman said:

I am sure that with a little more time and a little more discussion in this country, the public conscience and the good sense of the American people will assert themselves and we shall be in a position to enact an immigration and naturalization policy that will be fair to all.

That time has now come. Moral and national interest reasons justify a new immigration policy. Aside from its racial and ethnic discriminations, the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 fails to give sufficient recognition to the principle of family unity. It fails to give sufficient recognition to the great dimensions of the world refugee problem and the urgent need in this country for special skill immigrants.

Little wonder President Kennedy labeled the present law "an anachronism," a system "without basis in either logic or reason," a policy which "neither satisfies a national need nor accomplishes an international purpose."

The major objectives of the pending legislation are:

First, to restore equality and fair play in our method of selecting immigrants. Discriminatory provisions against immigrants from eastern and southern Europe, token quotas for Asian and African countries, and implications of race superiority in the Asia-Pacific triangle concept, have no place in the public policy of the United States.

A newcomer should not arrive at our Nation's door apologizing for his parentage and birthplace. Such a system is blatantly un-American.

True, we need a careful selection of immigrants. We should be selective—but not with theories of racial or ethnic superiority.

Congress must enact a statute that will be discriminatory in the best meaning of the word—on the grounds of individual worth and capacity; on the grounds of national security, and of economic and scientific benefit; on the principles of family unity and asylum to the homeless and oppressed.

Such discrimination is tolerable and in our Nation's interest.

On such grounds alone, I urge support of the pending measure—for it removes the purely arbitrary barriers to immigration on the basis of race and national origins; it substitutes a new formula based on equality and fair play; it applies this formula without exception to the people of all nations.

In referring to the national origins system in his immigration message, President Johnson said:

That system is incompatible with our basic American tradition \* \* \* The fundamental, longtime American attitude has been to ask not where a person comes from but what are his personal qualities \* \* \* Violation of this tradition by the national origins quota system does incalculable harm. The procedures imply that men and women from some countries are, just because of where they come from, more desirable citizens than others. We have no right to disparage the ancestors of millions of our fellow Americans in this way. Relationships with a number of countries, and hence the success of our foreign policy, is needlessly impeded by this proposition.

Mr. President, a compelling priority in any reform bill is the urgent need to facilitate the reunion of families. The measure before us today stresses family unity, and accords nonquota status to the children, the spouses, and the parents of U.S. citizens. There is little doubt this measure goes a long way in solving the most pressing problem in immigration matters—family reunion.

Mr. President, a third objective of the pending bill concerns the economic value of immigration. Selective immigration can help meet urgent manpower needs. This fact is recognized in the present law which affords first preference to immigrants with special skills. Experience indicates, however, that the national origins quota system has inhibited the full use of this preference.

Congress recognizes this situation, and has passed special legislation to permit the nonquota entry of selected immigrants. A good example is Public Law 87-885, to permit the nonquota entry of several thousand specialized immigrants. These were persons certified by the Attorney General as having services urgently needed in the United States because of their education, special training, or exceptional ability. The bill cleared the way for a number of distinguished scientists whose special talents are vital to the performance of important defense work. Nearly 50 hospitals, universities, and research organizations in all parts of the Nation are also benefiting by this special enactment. Under the national origins system these needed persons were inadmissible to our country.

There is a sincere and quite understandable concern in some quarters over the economic impact of the projected change in our method of selecting immigrants. But, I submit to the skeptics, the pending measure will continue the historic value of immigration to our economy.

Postwar immigration trends provide a reliable barometer for the future. Of the 4,400,000 immigrants who entered this country between 1947 and 1964, only 47 percent, some 2,100,000, actually en-

tered the labor force. The percentage figure for 1964 was below this average—some 44 percent. The remaining immigrants were housewives, children, and retired people. But they all have become consumers in the economy.

Of this immigrant work force, some 16 percent, nearly 350,000, were professional and technical workers. Nearly an equal number were skilled workers.

The record will show that the occupational distribution of recent immigrants has coincided with the needs of our economy. When these needs were inadequately filled under the basic quota formula, they were met by Congress with special legislation.

In 1964 alone, over 20,000 immigrants in critical occupations, and listed by the Secretary of Labor, entered this country. Two out of every three professionals were in this category. Recent Labor Department reports reflect a continuing steady demand for qualified workers in many areas. Selective immigration under the pending legislation will help fill these jobs.

In a recent report the National Science Foundation investigated the contribution made to America's professional scientific manpower pool by foreign-born scientists and engineers. The report is directly related to the subject of immigration, the integration of immigrants into our society, and the continued need for specialized personnel. The conclusions stated in part:

Migrations to the United States have generally brought valuable numbers of scientists and persons capable of being trained as scientists \* \* \* It is particularly interesting that the percentage of immigrant scientists in the United States has tended to increase in proportion to the level of scientific eminence.

The majority of immigrant scientists in the United States probably settle down quickly in their new environment and make valuable contributions both to the cause of American science and to the general good of the Republic. Social and cultural maladjustment among immigrant scientists appears to be quite slight.

Despite the fairly large influx of foreign scientists during the 1950's, there is no evidence that native American scientists have been placed in any great disadvantage by their presence. Since domestic institutions of higher education do not yet produce the country's annual needed aggregate of scientists, it would seem reasonable to assume that the American scientific community could continue to absorb foreign scientists at approximately their present rate of entry for some time to come.

Under section 10 of the bill, there is set forth a new directive to the Secretary of Labor for determining the needs for skilled and unskilled workers. Properly administered, I believe these guidelines will enable the American worker to be assured that his job security is not threatened by any new immigration. And it ought not to be threatened. At the same time it will permit a more precise determination of the availability of employment for these particular skills in a specific labor market area.

It is my understanding that when an immigrant seeks admission under these categories as special immigrants or preference immigrants and a determination by the Secretary of Labor is required,

the Secretary will make a certification in the case of the individual immigrant. He must ascertain the prospective immigrant's skill and will match those skills with the employment and manpower reports he has available from the labor market area where the immigrant expects to reside. On the basis of such an analysis the Secretary will be in a position to meet the requirement of the law, and provide the type of employment safeguards sought in this legislation.

Mr. President, the fourth objective of the pending measure reflects a sensitivity to the continuing problem of refugees, chiefly those from Communist dominated areas. In striking contrast to the lack of policy in present law, the legislation before us accords a preference status to some 10,200 refugees annually. This authority will provide a needed instrument in our foreign policy, and be a true reflection of all America's concern for the homeless and oppressed.

The inclusion of a refugee preference is progress, although I had hoped the bill would also include a more flexible provision to permit a speedy American response to emergency refugee situations such as occurred in the Hungarian revolution.

The parole provisions of present law, section 245, have been used in the past. This section is not repealed by the pending measure—and this is good. The House report, in outlining the specific use of the parole authority, might seem to attempt to exclude its application to large groups of refugees. At the same time, I would expect this general rule of thumb would not forego in all cases the use of section 245 for the conditional entry of refugees, if such were deemed in the national interest of our country. We cannot predict accurately what the future holds. But neither can we exclude a new Hungary and the terrible toll it will bring in human suffering and refugees. This will test the leadership of our country. The base provision in section 245 of existing law will continue to let our Nation respond quickly in dire emergency situations where freedom and lives of individuals are at stake.

Some 250,000 Cubans have fled to this country since 1959. It was while I served as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees that much of this activity occurred. Their presence here was, and is, a new experience for America. For the first time America found itself the country of first asylum for a large group of refugees. The usual concerns associated with a sudden and abnormal influx of new people which were voiced in those first days have not materialized. The resettlement program for the victims of Castro's tyranny have proved successful. They will stand to the credit of the people of our own country.

The measure before us includes a provision affording the Cuban refugees the opportunity for adjustment of status from parolee to permanent resident. This provision is along the lines of a bill I introduced earlier this year. This is an important and needed provision for many who seek permanent asylum in our country.



The United States has also had a positive experience with the more than 30,000 Dutch-Indonesian refugees admitted to this country, under special legislation, following their expulsion from Indonesia in the late fifties. Today some of these expellees remain in unsettled status in the Netherlands. These people also are deserving of additional resettlement opportunities in this country. The record on this bill should indicate there is a general awareness of the Dutch-Indonesian refugee problem, and that every effort should be made to provide resettlement opportunities within the framework of the pending legislation.

Mr. President, I have discussed briefly the desirable goals this bill will achieve. There is still another reason why I support the legislation. It is a basic reason, but one which too often escapes consideration. A plain and simple fact is this: the national origins quota system has never worked.

The statistical record of immigration presented in this debate, and in the hearings, demonstrates conclusively that the national origins system is unworkable and out of step with reality. Even on its own terms, and quite apart from any special legislation, the system failed in its purpose to select and admit immigrants in accordance with a basic racial and ethnic ratio.

Some will argue the special measures have brought refinement to our immigration policy. Have they really, Mr. President? I think not. For these efforts stop far short of a stable and permanent policy to which the people of this Nation can point with pride and accomplishment.

A brushfire approach to immigration and refugee problems does not satisfy the requirements of a useful immigration policy. The national origins quota system is widely and unfavorably known. The temporary exceptions which modify it beyond recognition, and make it contemporarily workable, are not known.

Thus America suffers needless stigma abroad, which blenches the leadership we claim is ours; which hampers our relations with other countries.

The pending legislation sets the record straight by updating our basic statute to conform more fully with our actual practice in the last several years.

Mr. President, the national origins quota system was conceived in a radical period of our history—a period of bigotry and prejudice. Thirty years later the system was reaffirmed—again in an atmosphere of fear and suspicion.

A measure of greatness for any nation is its ability to recognize past errors in policy, and its willingness to reform.

Today is a time for such action on the oldest theme of our Nation's history.

Even among those who favor the bill, there are many perspectives. Each person sees it through a different window and through prisms colored by prejudice, personal increase, idealism, and logic.

To a Polish-American housewife in Detroit, the bill means an opportunity to bring her father and brothers to this country, thus reuniting the family.

To a Coldwater, Mich., manufacturer of medical supplies, the bill means the opportunity to import a skilled East Indian skeleton assembler, a man whose skills cannot be found in this country.

To professors at a midwestern university, the bill means that they may be able to enlist the help of a highly-trained Japanese heart disease researcher.

To State Department officials, the bill represents a public relations coup that will relieve them of the necessity of explaining away what to many nations must seem an inconsistency in American thought.

To those of us in Congress who have pressed for this legislation, enactment may represent the chance to point out the fulfillment of a campaign promise.

And there is an Italian gentleman in Boston—whom I know through correspondence—who is delighted with the bill because it will let more Italians in and he thinks Italians are better than anyone else—exactly the sort of thinking that the bill seeks to get us away from.

And, of course, there are those thousands who are eager for enactment because current immigration policy seriously offends their sense of fair play, their loyalty to the treasured philosophies of Jefferson.

Yet, all of these viewpoints—favorable to the bill as they may be—must be considered subordinate to a greater perspective—the view that history will take on our actions here.

The viewpoint must necessarily be a very benign one. Because here is what this bill says:

It says that we have the right to limit the numbers who may come here.

It says we have the right to set qualifications to insure that newcomers will be loyal, law abiding, sound of mind and body.

It says that the unification of families is clearly desirable.

It says we have the right to say that those who come should bring a skill that will be useful to our society.

But what it says most clearly is this: The desirability of any immigrant does not depend on his place of birth.

And that is why history cannot but applaud this action.

Because this bill confirms the notion—so often cherished in words but too seldom practiced in deed—that a man's ability to serve, to contribute, does not depend on his race, color, or birthplace.

When history counts the steps that were taken toward human dignity, toward world understanding, toward good feeling among men, when history counts the measures this Nation took to establish the principles of equality, to set an example of compassion, and to treat all men with equal grace, this legislation, this immigration bill, which I am proud to have introduced, will not go unmentioned.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I wish to express my great appreciation for the comments of the Senator from Michigan this afternoon. I believe they will provide Members of the Senate with an

understanding and enlightenment which will be extremely important during the next few days of debate.

I believe every Senator realizes that it was the Senator from Michigan who introduced administration bill S. 500. So this is a matter in which he has been deeply interested. He has served well as a member of the Immigration Subcommittee and he has displayed his deep interest by following the hearings closely and by making a major contribution to the development of this bill. I have always looked to him for guidance and understanding in meeting the many problems that we faced in revising the immigration laws.

I believe his statement this afternoon will be most helpful to the Senate. I commend the Senator from Michigan for his fine presentation and thank him again for his great assistance.

If this bill is successful in the Senate—and I am confident it will be—we can trace one of the important lines leading to the acceptance and adoption of the measure by the Senate to his personal interest and commitment to this question.

Mr. HART. I am grateful for the kind words of the Senator from Massachusetts. I shall share with him an excitement and sense of joy when the happy hour arrives and the roll is called and the bill becomes law under his management.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it gives me a great sense of satisfaction to vote for H.R. 2580, the immigration bill. For those of us who have had to work with the existing laws and to witness the little tragedies the national origins test has caused to so many, it is, indeed, a fine day and a fine opportunity.

The real strength of our country comes from the diversity of our citizenry, joined by common goals, not common pasts. We are a nation of people devoted more to the future than preservation of what has gone before.

We have drawn upon the history of every nation and people to form our country and shape our thoughts, but we have gone beyond them all to mold a single, distinct culture.

The bill before us now promises greater opportunity for all of us to benefit from the thoughts, ideas, and desires of the rest of the world. As a nation we shall benefit far more from the removal of the national origins test than will any single immigrant, or all of them together.

Fears that this bill is an "Open, Sesame" are unfounded. In many respects it tightens the law. It gives the key to the golden door, primarily to families of Americans and to those others whose talents and skills we need.

I am proud, Mr. President, to vote for this bill. It does not do all I should want it to do, but I support it strongly nevertheless. I submitted for myself and Senators INOUE, BREWSTER, GRUENING, HARTKE, MAGNUSON, MCGEE, MORSE, RANDOLPH, and YOUNG of Ohio, Amendment No. 56 to S. 500, the Senate version of the pending legislation. This amendment would have permitted people from Bermuda, the Bahamas and certain of the Antilles to be considered in respect

to our immigration policy as citizens of the Western Hemisphere instead of as citizens of subquota areas. From 1921 to 1924 the adjacent islands to the United States were excluded from those countries which had quota restrictions. These islands were, in fact, given the status which the bill before us accedes to the new republics such as Trinidad-Tobago.

The present bill contemplates, under the Western Hemisphere rule, only those countries which are independent and thus continues the hardship on the small island areas which can never become independent because of their accident of location, size and lack of natural resources. Yet, from 1921 to 1924, these adjacent islands enjoyed the same benefits as the rest of the Western Hemisphere. These islands will be grouped now ultimately into the world quota and, as a consequence, face a potential of no possibility of immigration to the United States.

It does seem incongruous that less than one-half of 1 percent of the total Western Hemisphere population should be excluded from consideration with the other 99½ percent.

I do not propose to offer my amendment from the floor at this time. Nothing should impede the progress of this legislation. I intend, however, to introduce legislation in the next session to allow people from the adjacent islands to immigrate as do all others from the Western Hemisphere nations. We should not permit such petty inequities to continue. I hope others will join me in this effort.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the rule of germaneness still in effect?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time under the rule of germaneness expired 9 minutes ago.

#### DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I rise in defense of the position taken with respect to the actions of the United States in the Dominican Republic by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

To my deep regret, this puts me in opposition to my good friends the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

I had occasion to call to the attention of Senators earlier this week a most interesting article which appeared in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times, written by the able and veteran reporter, Tom Wicker, the principal Capitol Hill reporter for the New York

Times, entitled "Winds of Change in the Senate."

In his article Mr. Wicker commented, and I think with reason, that the art of debate appears to have been more or less lost in this body to which I am so proud to belong.

Possibly even by speaking to a completely empty Chamber on a Friday afternoon—which I regret to state is usually the case when I rise to address the Senate—I hope I can do a little to revive the tradition of debate which down through the years has made our legislative body an institution of which I hope the American people are still proud.

Before addressing myself to the substance of the disagreement between the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the three other Senators whom I have mentioned, I should like to make four preliminary remarks.

First, nobody—I repeat nobody—least of all the Senator from Arkansas—has attacked the President of the United States for what he did in the Dominican crisis. The position of the Senator from Arkansas, with which I agree, is that the President got bad advice—very bad advice. But having received that advice from individuals in his administration whom he had good reason to trust, particularly advice with respect to facts which turned out to be wrong, the President had no alternative except to do pretty much what he did. Therefore, I would make it clear that neither the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] nor I, despite what the three Senators have said to the contrary, have said one single word in criticism of the President.

My second point is that what may or may not have happened when the President called certain legislative leaders to the White House to discuss the crisis in the Dominican Republic, after he had decided to send the Marines in, but before they had actually gone, is entirely irrelevant to the points raised by the Senator from Arkansas. The Senator from Arkansas has no responsibility whatever for the decision made at the White House. He was in no position at that point to disagree with what the President recommended, because his sources of information were no different from those of the President. I believe it grossly unfair for the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to criticize the Senator from Arkansas for having remained silent at the White House after the President announced he was going to send in the troops.

In fact, the Senator from Arkansas said in his speech that he agrees that it was probably necessary to send a small force of Marines into Santo Domingo to protect American lives, particularly in view of the intelligence information, much of it inaccurate, which had come to the White House at that time. I agree with that, too. I believe we were under an obligation, despite our treaty obligations to the contrary, to send in a small force to protect American lives.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that no American lives were lost. Despite the gross exaggeration with respect to the alleged danger under which

Americans and other foreigners found themselves in Santo Domingo in those critical days toward the end of April, not one single American life was lost.

So I reiterate that, in my opinion, the Senator from Arkansas is subject to no just criticism because he did not object when the President, at the White House, announced that he had decided to send in the Marines. This argument is especially irrelevant to any issue raised by the Senator from Arkansas in his carefully thought-through and closely reasoned speech. I hope we shall hear no more in criticism of the Senator from Arkansas for what he did or did not do at the White House conference.

My third preliminary comment is that the Senator from Arkansas based his speech on 6 weeks of testimony in executive session before the Committee on Foreign Relations, at which practically every witness from the administration who participated in the Dominican crisis, with three exceptions, was heard and examined at some length by members of the committee. The speech was based also on newspaper articles, weekly news magazine articles, and other information from reputable American journalists, information which was available to the Committee on Foreign Relations as well as to the three Senators I have mentioned.

I sat through those hearings. I either heard the testimony—and I usually did hear the testimony and the cross-examination—of each of the witnesses, or, if I could not be present, I went to the committee room later and read the testimony, including the cross-examination. I can testify from my own personal knowledge that the comments of the Senator from Arkansas are fully and accurately documented by the classified record in the files of the Committee on Foreign Relations. If any Senator doubts what I say, I urge him or her to read that record.

I do not know whether the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], or the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] have read that record. Perhaps they will tell us in due course. However, I do know that, with the possible exception of a total of approximately one-half hour, when one of those Senators may have been present at one of those hearings, they did not show up at all. Therefore, their criticism of what the Senator from Arkansas has said is not based on any knowledge of that record in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

This is not necessarily a cause for serious criticism. No doubt the Senators have other sources of information than those which were available to me and to the Senator from Arkansas and to the members of the committee. They are certainly entitled to come in on the floor of the Senate and say whatever they think about it.

The point I want to make is that every single statement of the Senator from Arkansas is carefully documented in the official record of the hearings over which he presided. I raise several questions as to whether these other three Senators can document what they have said.



The fourth preliminary point that I should like to make is that the real issue with respect to the Dominican Republic is not: "Did we do the right thing or did we not do the right thing? Did we, as the Senator from Arkansas says, react too slowly in the first place and then overreact in the second place? Were our activities on the whole in the best interests of the United States of America or not?" These are not the issues.

The real issue is, Where do we go from here? What have we done, if anything, by this action to downgrade the influence of the United States of America through all of Latin America? And what can we do to remedy the harm?

If, as I firmly believe, we have lost many friends and made some enemies, what can we do to remedy that situation so that we can get back to the foreign policy to which John Fitzgerald Kennedy so ably led us when he advocated and pressed through Congress the Alliance for Progress bill, when he revived the good neighbor policy of his predecessor, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, when he offered the hand of friendship to those democratic nations of Latin America which believe that through social, economic, and political democracy Latin America can arise and defeat communism.

I ask the question whether we help defeat communism by standing up for a landed oligarchy governed by military junta groups which have come to be known in Latin America not as guerrillas, but as gorillas, by defying and suppressing efforts for land reform, for housing reform, for education, for health, for feeding the poor, by keeping in office economically as well as politically discredited oligarchies, or do we do better in the interest of the United States in supporting men like Betancourt, and Leoni in Venezuela, and Belaunde in Peru, and the successors of Jose Figueres in Costa Rica, and Frei Montalva and other splendid Latin Americans who are pressing to carry into effect the principles of the Alliance for Progress? Or do we do better if we put our blue chips on the military who come back, having learned the American way of life at the Command and General Staff School in Leavenworth?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Louisiana that I am most happy that he is on the floor.

I have a prepared address that I should like to deliver. Nevertheless, I should be very glad to yield to my friend from Louisiana, and I am sure that with that self-restraint for which he is so well known, he will ask a few questions and I shall do what I can to reply, and then I shall be permitted to continue.

I now yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I regret that I could not be here when the Senator commenced his address. I was attending a hearing of the Committee on Foreign Relations which dealt with the problem of wheat shipments to countries behind the Iron Curtain.

Mr. CLARK. I was present this morning at the same hearing and made my position clear. I hope that, in that event at least, the Senator from Louisiana and I will find ourselves on the same side.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope that we can discuss it. Perhaps we can agree.

As the Senator indicated, I did not have the opportunity to sit through the hearings to which he has referred. I have consulted with people who were either there and have read the record. I am not completely in the dark about what occurred in those hearings.

The Senator knows that I am the ranking member on the Committee on Finance. During that period I was attending hearings of the Finance Committee and also representing the Senate in conference with the House on a number of major bills and conference reports, some of which are now at the desk.

I would like to have been present at the hearings, but I was not able to be there. During that same period of time I was attending meetings at the White House, as the assistant majority leader, and did have available to me the same information which was available to the President.

My judgment of this situation is simply this: That what started in this area as a revolution by people who were not Communists, but who were seeking to overthrow what could perhaps be described as a rightwing government.

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senator referring to the Reid Cabral government?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I was referring to the so-called military junta.

Mr. CLARK. To the junta which succeeded the military government.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct. The three Communist Parties in that country moved in on this situation, as Communists always seek to do when chaos exists. They had gained a great deal of power and were on their way toward achieving control of this revolution.

The military junta group requested our Government to go in. Our Government inquired, "Are you requesting us to go in because you can no longer protect the Americans who are there?"

As I understand it, even the Senator from Arkansas does not dispute that the answer to that question was yes, and that it was proper that the United States send troops.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, from the attention that I was able to give to the problem, I understood that the Reid Cabral government had fallen for reasons which we do not need to go into. The government under Moreno Urillo, who was the legitimate successor of Bosch, thinking that it was defeated, had taken refuge in other Latin American and foreign embassies. At the instance of the CIA—I believe it can be documented—a new junta headed by a certain Colonel Benoit had been formed, although it was pretty well confined to the San Isidro airbase. That junta sent word to Ambassador Bennett, "You had better send American troops in because a Communist takeover threatens."

Ambassador Bennett sent word back, "I can't get away with bringing Americans in on that ground because the evidence is not clear. If you will change your request and make it in writing, and ask American forces to intervene in order to protect American lives, then I believe that we can persuade Washington to do it."

So Benoit changed his position and put it on the basis of protecting American lives. Bennett forwarded that post haste to the State Department and to the White House, and troops were sent in.

The President announced that he was doing it to protect American lives. However, Bennett also sent to Washington the original statement of Colonel Benoit, and, the day the troops landed, a totally unauthorized statement was made by one of the chief naval officers of the U.S. Navy in Santo Domingo that we were going in to crush the Communists.

It is all very well to talk about protecting American lives, but the real reason that the marines went in there was to prevent a Communist takeover.

At that point Admiral Rayburn, who had been sworn in as the new head of the CIA perhaps 24 hours before that—and a fine man he is; no doubt he had to rely entirely on the information which was coming to him from Santo Domingo—was able to produce the names of only three Communists who were said to be connected with the revolutionary movement. This was obviously not enough to impress the American people. Seventy-two hours later, they produced the names of 58 Communists, and thus made a somewhat better showing.

I do not have a shadow of a doubt that after we did what we did, by sending in around 20,000 troops, the three tiny Communist parties in the Dominican Republic, one of them Castro dominated, one of them Moscow dominated, one of them China dominated, were able to take such advantage of the confusion and lack of order in downtown Santo Domingo. The fact is that a lot of the Bosch people became scared and ran away to embassies because they thought they were defeated. I have no doubt that thereafter, the rebel movement was very strongly influenced by the Communists. But it was not in the beginning, and actually the Communists never deposed Caamaño Deno, the constitutional leader who is not a Communist.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My understanding of the matter was that the Communists had gained a great amount of control, and were in command in a substantial number of positions, many of them key positions in the revolution.

Based on what little we know, when we look at a situation of that sort, the revolution had more the earmarks of a Communist takeover than had Castro's, when Castro was taking over Cuba.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator made that argument very eloquently the other day on the floor. All I can say is, my sources of information are possibly different than his. I know this is the information put forth by the administration, and particularly by Mr. Thomas Mann, who was the architect of our policy. I merely disagree with it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is a matter of judgment. Perhaps the Senator would agree with me, that when the President of the United States becomes convinced, first, that American lives are in danger, he has a duty to protect those American lives; and, second, when he becomes convinced that failure to act means he is risking a Communist takeover of another nation in this hemisphere, in my judgment, if he fails to act, he is failing to discharge his responsibility to the American people.

In my judgment, had President Eisenhower known that the Castro takeover in Cuba was going to work out the way it did, things might have been different.

There were in the Castro movement a number of Communists who claimed they were not Communists—Castro claimed he was not a Communist. He lied to us. That is part of the Communist technique.

As a matter of fact, under Communist doctrine, as I am sure the Senator knows, truth from the Communist viewpoint is that which advances the spread of communism. So, if I say this man taking these notes is a man, if that does not promote the spread of communism, from the Communist point of view I have told a lie; according to Communist teaching, I should have said, "That's a woman."

Castro used those techniques on us. We did not know who all the Communists were in the Dominican Republic, but we knew many of them. Some were Castro-trained. As the Senator pointed out, some of them were the Peiping-type Communists, who would blast us off the face of the earth tomorrow if they had enough atom bombs, and some were the Russian type, experts in subversion. But they had enough help that they were in the process of taking over the revolution. That was the information available to the President; and if the Senator will check, he will find out that is what was happening.

If what the Dominican people want is a progressive reform government, a government with liberal ideas, such as the Senator has and as I myself have, then the people will have the opportunity to elect that sort of government and, in my judgment, they will be able to thank the United States of America that they have that opportunity, because if those Communists had taken over they would never have had it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator made this same argument very eloquently on the floor of the Senate just a few days ago. I respect his integrity and his conviction. I said, perhaps before the Senator came in, that I thought he and the Senator from Florida were quite unfair to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] by trying to throw the blame on him for not objecting to sending in the troops when he was summoned to the White House with some of the other leaders in the last days of April.

I pointed out then, and I point out again, that nobody is attacking the President of the United States—neither the Senator from Arkansas nor I. He said and I say that if we had had to make our decision on the basis of the information

that came to him at the time he determined to send the troops in, we would have sent troops in, too. I do not think we would have sent so many, but we certainly would have sent in some.

I think the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Louisiana really do a disservice and an injustice to the Senator from Arkansas by trying to say that he or I or anybody else is attacking the President of the United States, or that he or I or anybody else should have spoken up before the troops went in.

That is not the issue. The issue is: Was the advice that came to the President of the United States accurate? I say it was not. Were the recommendations that came to him from his subordinates sound? I say they were not.

But with the information he had, he had no other choice.

With respect to the position of the Senator from Louisiana about Castro's Cuba, it seems to me that is largely irrelevant and, in the end, the difference of opinion between the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Louisiana is just this simple: Whose judgment is right?

I firmly believe that had we not done what we did in the Dominican Republic in the last days of April, the posture of the United States throughout Latin America would be far higher today than it is. Santo Domingo would have had the kind of government we wanted months before it did, and the whole posture of our relationship with the world in general, but with Latin America in particular, would have been better.

I point out to the Senator from Louisiana, as he knows, that I am a staunch supporter of the Johnson administration, as is the Senator from Louisiana. Every now and then, we stray off the reservation a little bit, but most of the time, we are supporting the President and his program, and the Great Society.

But if the balance of powers and the separation of powers means anything, then the Senator from Louisiana and I have not only the right but the duty to speak our minds when we disagree with the policy laid down by the Chief Executive; and with deep regret, that is what I am doing now. I say to my friend from Louisiana, I shall be back on the team on Monday when the immigration bill comes up. I hope he will be there, too, with me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator that it seems to me that fundamentally, his case is to establish that the Communists had no substantial influence, and were not achieving increased influence, in that revolutionary group. If he cannot establish that; if the contrary was true, and the Communists were achieving more and more power in that revolt, it seems to me the Senator has not established his case, but rather the case which supports the President and his advisers.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say, with all the deep affection I feel for my friend from Louisiana, that I do not think I have to make any case. The case has been made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. All I am

doing now is to rebut the efforts of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] in their attack on the case made by the Senator from Arkansas.

I stand foursquare on the speech made by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator from Louisiana has ably attempted to oppose that case. But I am not here making any case at all. I stand foursquare on what I consider the brilliant, able, and constructive speech made by the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator from Pennsylvania hear the speech of the Senator from Ohio on the floor today?

Mr. CLARK. Which Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. CLARK. No; but out of the deep affection and high regard that I have for my close friend the senior Senator from Ohio, I shall certainly be happy to read his speech. I am sorry I did not hear it. I certainly would not wish to prejudice the position taken by my good friend from Ohio, but I can say, generally speaking, that in matters of this sort the senior Senator from Ohio and I rarely find ourselves in agreement.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is the Senator aware of the speech made by the majority leader today in support of the President's action? It seems to me that the Senator ought to be aware of the fact that he is answering more than three Senators.

Mr. CLARK. If it is necessary to answer five, I shall be glad to take on five. As the colloquy thus far indicates, I am having great difficulty taking on one Senator, my good friend from Louisiana.

Now, Mr. President, I return to the major part of my speech. I suggest that the three Senators I have mentioned have not only failed to refute the seven specific conclusions reached by the Senator from Arkansas, but for the most part have refused to meet him head on and have tended to go off on irrelevant side channels having nothing whatever to do with the major impact of the speech of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Let me give an example. The Senators from Louisiana and Florida have both argued that there was need for hasty action in that fatal last week of April of this year, and that there was no time to evaluate the situation judiciously. Then they make the basic and I believe false assumption that the only rapid form of action which could be taken was that which was taken; namely, massive military intervention on the side of the militarists who had kicked out the only legitimate, democratically elected government the Dominican Republic had had in the course of 38 years.

Actually, the Senator from Arkansas criticized the administration for timidity as well as for overreaction. He pointed out that we should have moved long before we did to support the legitimate



government of the Dominican Republic, represented in the first stages of the revolution by the acting president, Molina Urena.

The Senator from Arkansas pointed out that there were two opportunities, first, on April 25, when the PRD, which was the Bosch party, and the only really democratic party of the moderate left in the Dominican Republic, requested a U.S. presence, by which they meant our Government's support for return to constitutional government under Bosch; and, second, 2 days later, on April 27, when the constitutionalists—sometimes erroneously called the rebels—thinking themselves defeated, appealed to Ambassador Bennett for mediation, a request which he refused on the ground that it would have constituted intervention.

Thus, the Senator from Arkansas called not for inaction, but for even more rapid action, which was eventually taken—and on the wrong side.

The issue is not whether it should have been action, but what kind of action. The administration ended intervening in a massive way with military forces on April 28. The Senator from Arkansas would have had us intervene politically either 1 or 3 days earlier.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] contends, on page 23863 of the RECORD, and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] suggested, on page 5 of a judiciary subcommittee document entitled "Organization of American States Combined Reports on Communist Subversion," that the OAS mediation team sent to Santo Domingo, by the 10th meeting of consultation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics wholly and completely justified the unilateral intervention of the United States in Santo Domingo. But, a reading of the report establishes, clearly indeed, that this is not the fact. The report describes the situation as one of chaos in security replete with human suffering. It supports the efforts of members of the OAS committee to bring about a cease-fire. It contains a proposal for the dispatching of an inter-American force which, in fact, had already been decided upon, but it contains no statement whatever endorsing the unilateral action of the United States, although the two Senators I have mentioned state categorically that the committee's report did exactly that.

Critics of the Senator from Arkansas contend that there was clear danger to American lives in Santo Domingo, and that this was the prime reason for the intervention of the United States. I have dealt with that comment earlier in this talk. I can only say now that I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that there was danger to Americans, although no American was, in fact, killed or wounded until after the marines went in and started exchanging fire with the constitutional forces.

I say that on the basis of Monday morning quarterbacking—and I agree that what I am doing, what the Senator from Arkansas did, and to some extent what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Lou-

isiana [Mr. LONG] have been doing is Monday morning quarterbacking—on the basis of a calm and judicious review of what happened, there is very little doubt that the principal motive for American intervention was to save military and dictatorial forces in the Dominican Republic from a military defeat.

Ambassador Bennett requested walkie-talkies for the military junta, and he got them. When Colonel Benoit, then head of the military junta, asked for American intervention, he got it. He got it on a ground which, to put it mildly, was not a candid statement of the facts.

In any case, it is a documented fact that Ambassador Bennett, on April 27, when the militarists were winning, refused to intervene to support the constitutional government which was the successor of the only democratically elected government the Dominican Republic had had for over a generation.

Then, the next day, when it looked as though the Constitutionalists were going to win, Ambassador Bennett pleaded desperately and successfully for intervention on the side of the militarists.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] states in the RECORD, on page 24168, and not for the first time, that the Senator from Arkansas' criticism of the recommendations of the President's advisers is organically related to a document entitled "Background Information Relating to the Dominican Republic," which was prepared by the staff Committee on Foreign Relations, with the assistance of the Legislative Reference Service.

The Senator suggests that this documentation and supporting chronology have been heavily slanted against the administration by the careful process of editorial selection.

I hold in my hand the document in question. It starts out with what I believe all will admit to be a definitely nonpartisan statement, that on December 5, 1492, Columbus discovered America. It happened to be the island of Hispaniola, and of course he stopped off on his way at the little island in the Bahamas, San Salvador.

But I submit to any objective observer who wants to test the validity of the charge of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] that the rest of the chronology is just as objective and unslanted as the original statement which I have just read—and it is composed largely of official administration statements which may have turned out to be damaging to the administration's case, but certainly were not consciously intended to achieve that result—actually this chronology was not drawn, as the Senator from Connecticut contends, from anti-administration press sources, but, rather, primarily from a noncontroversial source entitled "Deadline Data on World Affairs," and from major metropolitan newspapers, including the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the Times of London, Der Welt of Hamburg, the London Economist, the London Observer, Le Monde of Paris.

I submit, and I would hope the Senator from Connecticut would agree, that these

are reputable metropolitan journals, which, by and large, tend to support the administration. If they were critical of U.S. policy in the Dominican Republic, this might suggest that there is something wrong with that policy rather than that the committee and its staff, and the editorial and reportorial writers who prepared this documentation, were biased.

Actually, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] pointed out, the only nonadministration witness whom the Committee on Foreign Relations heard was the former Governor of Puerto Rico, Munoz Marin, a strong supporter of the administration. I felt the committee should have heard witnesses in opposition to the administration's policy. The chairman, and I suspect a majority of our colleagues on that committee, felt that if we had opened the hearing up to press reporters who had been on the scene, we would have gotten into a Donnybrook which would have been difficult to bring to a conclusion, and the decision was made not to call the other witnesses.

I said earlier that I think there were three witnesses who should have been called. One was John Bartlow Martin, who wrote what I believe to be a highly inaccurate story of what he found in the Dominican Republic. He was down there as a representative of the administration, and upon his return, he wrote this rather extraordinary article in one of the leading outlets of the Luce publications.

I think it is a little unusual, from the protocol point of view, for a former Foreign Service officer—in fact, the former Ambassador to the Dominican Republic—to go down to the Dominican Republic, spend a week, fail in his efforts to bring peace, and then come back and write his side of the story for Life magazine.

It is not for me to criticize. I think he should have been called as a witness, and we should have had an opportunity to question him with respect to his participation in the crisis.

The second witness who I think should have been called was McGeorge Bundy, who went to the Dominican Republic at the request of the President, and spent 10 days down there, trying, unsuccessfully, to bring the crisis to an end. Mr. Bundy, in what I consider to be a disregard of the relevant precedents took refuge in executive privilege and refused to appear before the committee. At one point he said he would come and have tea with us, but then he refused even to do that.

The third witness, whom I hope we still may call when the time is right, is that wise, experienced, extraordinarily able veteran of the Foreign Service, who appears as of now, to have brought the crisis to a successful conclusion, with a display of diplomacy which evokes my admiration and I am sure that of every other member of the committee, regardless of their point of view with respect to this particular crisis, Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker.

I hope, when the smoke settles a little and the present temporary government of President Garcia Godoy is a little more firmly on its feet, Ambassador Bunker

will come and tell the Foreign Relations Committee about the situation he found when he went down there, and how he was able to bring about this near miracle, an instance of pulling a rabbit out of a hat, worthy, in my opinion, of the late Houdini.

The background information prepared by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Legislative Reference Service contains excerpts from the Rio de Janeiro Treaty and the Charter of the Organization of American States. A reading of articles 15, 17, and 19, of the OAS Charter and of article 6 of the Rio Treaty make it clear beyond peradventure of doubt that the United States of America's unilateral intervention in the Dominican Republic was illegal and unauthorized; and since these provisions of the inter-American agreements suggest unfavorable inferences about the administration's policy, perhaps the Senator from Connecticut is correct in regarding their inclusion in this document to which he objects as a reflection of prejudice upon the part of the committee and its staff.

I point out that all this week there has been meeting in the city of Washington an extraordinary group called the International Conference on World Peace Through World Law. Legal and judicial delegates from more than 110 nations attended. The President of the United States went before them yesterday morning and made an extraordinary able and moving address before that body, in which he placed the United States of America squarely on record as supporting the rule of law as against the rule of force. I was happy, indeed, to see the President of the United States take that position, and I hope from here on in the United States of America will practice what it preaches, and not talk about the rule of law out of one side of its mouth and violate it out of the other side.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood, because I say again, as the Senator from Arkansas said before, that I believe the initial intervention, had it been solely for the purpose of protecting American lives, was justified on humanitarian grounds. My position is that when that initial intervention was multiplied by many thousands of troops, and when the ostensible objective to protect American lives was converted by advisers of the administration into an effort to intervene in a civil war to prevent an alleged Communist takeover, its illegality became obvious and apparent.

I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut, an extremely useful Member of this body and a good friend of mine, will, on second thought, want to withdraw the suggestion which he made at pages 24171 and 24172 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the Senator from Arkansas is soft on communism.

I suggest that the freedom of both public and private men to speak out in candor, either for or against official policy, is an integral part of the American form of liberty, and also an integral part of our constitutional form of government, which requires that the Senate of the United States, as a part of the legislative branch,

advise and consent to the activities of the executive.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared on September 17, in the Washington Post entitled "Panic Button."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 17, 1965]

#### PANIC BUTTON

Senator DODD's reply to Senator FULBRIGHT's critique of the American military intervention in the Dominican Republic is essentially to try to depict Mr. FULBRIGHT as soft on communism. This tawdry if familiar tactic does Mr. DODD no credit. There is legitimate ground for disagreement with Mr. FULBRIGHT's analysis, which had the benefit of 4 months of hindsight, without attempting to smear his motives.

That there were, and are, Communists in the Dominican Republic no one disputes; here Mr. DODD is tilting at the wrong windmill. What is disputed is whether they were in a position to capture the revolution that the United States in effect halted when representatives of the American Embassy induced the administration to push the panic button. Some influential anti-Communist Dominicans think they were not.

Nowhere does Mr. DODD deal with several basic questions raised by Mr. FULBRIGHT: Did the United States fully use the resources available to it without sending in the marines—and was the administration candid with the public? Obviously the United States must be alert to Castroite maneuvers, including efforts to take over and direct local grievances. But if we allow American policy to be dominated and even paralyzed by fear of another Cuba, we shall soon find ourselves sending marines around the hemisphere losing friends and alienating people.

Mr. DODD contends, and some in the administration agree with him, that Mr. FULBRIGHT's speech damaged the country because the criticism will be picked up abroad. On the contrary the intervention, whether or not it was necessary, is what started the process. One of the strengths of America in the eyes of other peoples—and a point that can belie Mr. FULBRIGHT's complaint that the United States appears unsympathetic to demands for social justice abroad (by contrast with the social revolution taking place at home)—is that we can debate issues publicly and seek to learn from experience. But to argue that all's well that ends well in the Dominican Republic is like insisting that because a broken leg ultimately heals it somehow is good for you.

Mr. CLARK. The editorial concludes that those who "argue that all is well that ends well in the Dominican Republic, is like insisting that because a broken leg ultimately heals it somehow is good for you."

I suggest that the criticism of our Dominican policy made by the Senator from Arkansas was healthy, salutary, and in the long run will be helpful to the administration and to the future conduct of our foreign policy in Latin America.

Senator FULBRIGHT needs no defense from me against the charge that he is soft on communism. I suspect that every one of the other 99 Senators in this body, including the Senator from Connecticut, on second thought, would stand up and defy anybody who, outside these halls, said that he was.

There is no more loyal, intelligent, and able American in our country than the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I say again that I am sure, on further reflection, that the Senator from Connecticut will wish to withdraw the implication contained in the quotation from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which I have just made.

I further suggest that, as I said earlier, the current debate reflects great credit on the spirit of liberty and the spirit of freedom of speech in the Senate and the country at large.

In fact, the criticism of Senator FULBRIGHT is already beginning to have a positive effect in Latin America. Conversations with Latin Americans in Washington, especially the younger ones who were not tied to either the militarists or economic oligarchists, suggest that by bringing this matter into the open, as the Senator from Arkansas has done, he repairs the bitter disillusionment with the United States some of our best friends south of the border now feel. It is reviving some feeling of hope that the United States is still the friend of Latin American democracy.

This position is well developed by Senator FULBRIGHT on pages 23860 and 23861 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I suggest that the further point may now be stressed: that strong self-criticism of our country, of the administration, of its foreign policy, both in the Senate and elsewhere, is essential to clearing the air and restoring an honest and friendlier relationship between the United States and the democratic nationalist reformers who are our best friends in Latin America.

Acknowledgment of error, mistaken action, and lack of candor is not only essential to dispel lingering disillusionment, but it is also a convincing demonstration of good faith on the part of the people of the United States toward those able and dedicated Latin Americans who are devoting their lives toward establishing in that important area of the world the same kind of democratic pluralistic society of which we are so proud in the United States of America.

I conclude to some extent as I started.

The questions are not so much what did we do in the months of April, May, June, July, and August in the Dominican Republic, but first what are the implications of what we did on the future of our Latin American policy?

And second, if we did make mistakes—and I think we did—what can we now do to remedy them?

I suggest that Under Secretary of State Mann and Assistant Secretary of State Jack Vaughn would be well advised, and I hope they will be, if they devote their best efforts from here on in patching up our damaged relationships with those men in Latin America and the countries they represent who are our real friends: the democratic, the liberal, and, if you will, the slightly left-of-center leaders, not the military juntas or the oligarchical landowners, who are cheering what we did in the Dominican Republic.

I suggest we look to Belamunde Terry, Leoni, Betancourt in Venezuela, Jose



Figueros and his successors in Costa Rica.

I suggest we look to President Frei, of Chile, at this moment the greatest of them all, who fought Communists to a standstill and obtained a free liberal democratic, New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, Great Society government in that magnificent and hard-pressed thin stretch of liberty in South America, a government which supports the same essential freedoms which we are so proud of here.

I suggest we look to Alberto Lleras in Colombia, and the men who support his policy there.

These are the true friends of America. These are the countries where the Alianza para el Progreso has the best chance of success. It is here that we should be looking to bolster American policy, to give these men and these countries our assistance, to hearten them, and congratulate them, because that is where the friends of the United States of America are located.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, September 20, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 17, 1965:

##### U.S. ATTORNEY

William H. Murdock, of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

William Medford, of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of North Carolina for the term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

##### POSTMASTERS

###### ALASKA

Herbert Apassingok, Sr., Gambell, Alaska, in place of John Apangalook, resigned.

###### ARIZONA

Homer L. Fancher, Bullhead City, Ariz., in place of B. E. Fox, retired.

###### CALIFORNIA

Dorothy M. Collis, Brentwood, Calif., in place of R. J. Wallace, retired.

Maynard Green, Covina, Calif., in place of C. G. McCarn, retired.

Theodore F. Locicero, Monterey, Calif., in place of L. S. Brown, retired.

Ellen C. Cothran, Westmorland, Calif., in place of F. F. Johnson, deceased.

###### COLORADO

Susan L. Thompson, Frisco, Colo., in place of R. S. Foote, retired.

James A. Guadnola, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of H. W. Cross, retired.

Robert W. Shewfelt, Parker, Colo., in place of Sophia Johnson, retired.

###### CONNECTICUT

Vincent P. Nolan, Southington, Conn., in place of E. C. Butler, deceased.

###### IDAHO

Daniel K. Wilson, Lapwai, Idaho, in place of C. F. Angel, retired.

##### ILLINOIS

Joseph A. Stal, Georgetown, Ill., in place of A. T. Humrichous, retired.

Marlin H. Ferguson, Hartford, Ill., in place of P. L. Reilly, deceased.

##### KENTUCKY

Franklin A. Orndorff, Adairville, Ky., in place of J. R. Trimble, retired.

##### MAINE

Chester W. Curtis, Richmond, Maine, in place of Don O. Cate, retired.

##### MASSACHUSETTS

Frieland C. Peltier, Oxford, Mass., in place of R. C. Taft, retired.

William F. Griffin, Rutland, Mass., in place of D. M. Lincoln, retired.

##### MICHIGAN

Leonard E. Amidon, Interlochen, Mich., in place of R. J. Buller, retired.

James R. Budak, Lakeside, Mich., in place of M. B. Perham, retired.

Calvin P. Leach, Le Roy, Mich., in place of H. B. Erickson, retired.

Mark C. Dilts, Mesick, Mich., in place of Ernest Belville, retired.

Lawrence A. Frith, Vermontville, Mich., in place of R. K. Kilpatrick, transferred.

##### MISSISSIPPI

William T. Hudspeth, Hickory Flat, Miss., in place of N. L. Hall, retired.

##### MISSOURI

John Rowlett, Jr., Maitland, Mo., in place of H. R. Cowan, retired.

##### NEBRASKA

Audrey A. Adams, Lyman, Nebr., in place of B. E. McKee, deceased.

Theodore R. Gaedke, Wellfleet, Nebr., in place of P. D. Coder, transferred.

##### NEW YORK

William B. Chavis, Long Eddy, N.Y., in place of S. F. Kenney, retired.

##### NORTH CAROLINA

William E. Twiford, Kill Devil Hills, N.C., in place of I. L. Twiford, retired.

##### NORTH DAKOTA

Edward A. Seel, Rugby, N. Dak., in place of H. D. Walland, retired.

##### OHIO

Henry C. Waggoner, Amsterdam, Ohio, in place of R. N. Croskey, resigned.

Carl J. Burkhardt, Leavittsburg, Ohio, in place of C. M. Burkhardt, retired.

Willard C. Gels, Massillon, Ohio, in place of J. E. Snee, retired.

William P. Moran, Roseville, Ohio, in place of M. D. Sowers, deceased.

##### OKLAHOMA

Charles M. McCurdy, Tupelo, Okla., in place of M. J. Finch, deceased.

##### PENNSYLVANIA

C. Jean Steinkirchner, Jennerstown, Pa., in place of E. K. Hay, retired.

##### SOUTH DAKOTA

LaVerne V. Johannessen, Erwin, S. Dak., in place of Catherine Kazmerzak, retired.

##### TENNESSEE

Robert M. Sams, Dandridge, Tenn., in place of R. S. Hill, deceased.

Harold A. Hutcheson, Soddy, Tenn., in place of J. H. Davenport, retired.

##### TEXAS

Edison Monroe, Eustace, Tex., in place of W. H. Wheeler, deceased.

Harold A. Doane, Jr., Haslet, Tex., in place of H. M. George, Jr., removed.

##### UTAH

Pete L. Bruno, Price, Utah, in place of William Grogan, retired.

Ernest R. Farnsworth, Santaquin, Utah, in place of R. J. Peterson, retired.

##### WASHINGTON

David L. Gray, Reardan, Wash., in place of L. A. Schultz, retired.

##### WEST VIRGINIA

William S. Penn, Jr., Bluefield, W. Va., in place of H. B. Faulkner, retired.

Charles H. Gillilan, Jr., Frankford, W. Va., in place of C. H. Gillilan, deceased.

##### WISCONSIN

Silas J. Paul, Montfort, Wis., in place of Harvey DiVall, retired.

Richard H. Vollmer, Mukwonago, Wis., in place of W. H. Ruppert, retired.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 17, 1965:

##### U.S. COAST GUARD

The following named officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade indicated:

##### To be lieutenants

Charles F. Reid.

Warren H. Madson.

##### To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Vincent E. Abrahamson

Gary L. Rowe

John R. Malloy III

Carl D. Bossard

Roy L. Foote

Richard S. Blizar

The nominations beginning John J. Soltys, Jr., to be lieutenant (junior grade), and ending Ted B. Bryant to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 31, 1965.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture: I Corinthians 13: 13: *And now abideth faith, hope, and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.*

Almighty God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, we thank Thee for the heritage of our beloved country which Thou didst lead through many difficulties and dangers to this day, and keep us in the highway of a divine mission.

We beseech Thee to awaken our minds and hearts with the wonder of Thy eternal presence and teach us to hush the beating of our own hearts that we may hear Thy voice in the storms and tumult of our days.

Give us a new sense of Thy power, when we are torn by dismay and despair, to guide us safely through the upheavals of these perilous times.

May our President, the Speaker, and all the Members of the Congress have an unwavering trust in Thee as they serve Thy cause of good will in the world where there is so much hatred and confusion.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.